लौकिकन्यायाञ्जलिः ॥

प्रथमो भागः ॥

A HANDFUL OF POPULAR MAXIMS.

लौकिकन्यायाञ्जलिः ॥

प्रथमो भागः ॥

A HANDFUL OF POPULAR MAXIMS

CURRENT IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE.

COLLECTED BY

Colonel G. A. Jacob,

INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Author of "Concordance to the Principal Upanishads," "Manual of Hindu Pantheism" &c, &c.

SECOND EDITION—REVISED AND ENLARGED.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED

BY

TUKÂRÂM JÂVAJÎ,

PROPRIETOR OF JÂVAJÎ DÂDÂJÎ'S "NIRṆAYA-SÂGARA" PRESS.

Bombay.

1907.

Price 6 Annas.

Registered under Act XXV of 1867.

EXTRACT FROM PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION.

IN Dr. Bühler's well-known Kashmir Report of 1877, we read the following:—"A curious and very useful though modern treatise is the *Laukikanyâyasangraha* of Raghunâth, a Rajput. This worthy has collected the *nyâyas* or 'inferences from familiar instances,' which occur in the *S'âstras,* especially those from the *Vedântas'âstra e. g. Daṇḍâpûpikânyâya, Dehalîdîpanyâya* &c. The collection is not complete, but contains a good deal more than that Professor Bâlas'âstrî has given in his article in the *Paṇḍit.** P. Vâmanâchârya Jhalkîkar is at present engaged on a still more extensive work on this subject, which will comprise about 900 such *nyâyas.*" Page 76.

The information given in the concluding sentence raised our hopes to a high pitch, for the need of such a work was great, and Bâlas'âstrî had explained only nine of those nyâyas. But alas! 'there's many a slip between the cup and lip,' and though we have waited for this "more extensive work" for 22 long years, there are still no signs of its appearing.

I have therefore determined to lay before the public the 'handful' of popular maxims which I have collected during many years of reading, in the hope that they may become the nucleus of a very much larger collection. In Târânâth Tarkavâchaspati's *Vâcaspatyam* we have a list of 151 nyâyas, popular and technical; but references to works where they are to be found are few and far between, and this considerably lessens their value. Thirty of these were reproduced in V. S. Âpṭe's dictionary, in 1890, but with the same defect. Again, in 1875, Paṇḍit Satyavrata Sâmas'rami published a small pamphlet of 36 popular maxims together with a larger number of purely technical ones, and professed to give a reference for each of them. But a man who refers you to the "Bhâgavata Purâṇa," to "A commentary on the Vedântabhâshya," or to "A commentary on the Kâvya-

*October and December 1867.

prakâs'a," and vouchsafes no further information whatever, is a worthless guide; and such mere semblance of guidance deserves nothing but reprobation. One can tolerate ambiguity of this kind in the ancient writings; but in modern times, when printed books of reference abound, such vagueness is inexcusable.

My list comprises only 'popular' maxims, and therefore such purely technical ones as *Adhyáropanyâya, kaimutikanyâya, guṇopasaṁhâranyâya,* and others of a similar nature, which abound in the philosophical and grammatical works, will not be found here. Moreover, I have rigorously excluded even popular maxims which I have been unable to find *in actual use in the literature,* deeming an unverified maxim with a mere dictionary-existence as of very little value.

* * * * * * *

I may add that about 22 illustrative sayings, which are practically *nyâyas,* might be gathered from the fourth Book of the *Sânkhyasûtras*; such as, for example, the well-known "अहिनिर्ल्वयनीवत्" and others more or less useful. Some of them were published in the *Paṇḍit* for December 1876, under the title of "Stories illustrative of the Sânkhya doctrine;" but the whole will be found translated in the volume of "Sânkhya Aphorisms" published in Trübner's Oriental Series.

* * * * * *

In concluding this preface I must apologize to the reader for not giving him a bigger 'handful' of maxims, and one of better quality. But what there is has been put together in defiance of the warnings of the skilful oculist in whose hands I have been for the last five years, and therefore at some risk to failing sight. May some younger scholar be provoked to the good work of giving us something fuller and better.

Redhill, Surrey.
July 1900.

G. A. J.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

Seven years have elapsed since the publication of this booklet, and, as my researches have been continued during the whole of the interval, I have naturally collected much additional material. Part of this was published as a "Second Handful" in 1902, and that was succeeded by a "Third" in 1904. During my reading I frequently came upon older references to many of the nyâyas first published, and these have now been utilized; whilst other changes, some of them of a radical nature, have been made, and a few new nyâyas added. The discovery of MSS. of Raghunâthavarman's works, as recorded in the preface to the "Second Handful", was of the utmost importance to me; but the student will find in my three small volumes some nyâyas which even he did not explain,—amongst which are the कृत्वाचिन्तान्याय and मणिमन्त्रन्याय here incorporated for the first time. I make no distinction now between what may be really called a 'popular' maxim, and one of a technical nature. Both need to be explained and illustrated, so both are freely admitted. I have thoroughly revised, and considerably enlarged, the "Second Handful" also, and hope soon to see it reprinted. It will contain, amongst much new matter, the story connected with the वधूमाषमापनन्याय which so long eluded me, and for which, as well as for several other valuable items of information, I am indebted to Mr. Govind Dâs, an Honorary magistrate of Benares. Another lover of Sanskrit has come to my help in the person of Mr. M. R. Telang, Head Shirastedar of the Bombay High Court, who has kindly supplied what was to me, at any rate, a novel interpretation of the लोष्टप्रस्तारन्याय. I am anxious to revise as soon as possible *the whole* of the nyâyas which I have endeavoured to elucidate, before increasing infirmities compel the abandonment of the studies which have been my delight for forty-six years.

I wish I could impart to some of my fellow countrymen resident in India, something of the enthusiasm which its grand literature awakened within me in the early part of my career, and which has never waned during this long intervening period. Such a hobby not only provides delightful mental exercise, but, better still, it draws one into *sympathetic touch* with the people amongst whom one's lot is cast.

Redhill, Surrey,
October, 1907.

G. A. JACOB.

List of Works quoted in the following pages.

Advaitabrahmasiddhi, of Sadânanda Yati; Bib. Ind., 1890.

Alankârasarvasva of Râjânaka Ruyyaka; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, Bombay, 1893.

Âpastamba-Gṛihyasûtra, with the Com. of Sudars'anârya; edited by Dr. Winternitz, Vienna, 1887.

Âtmatattvaviveka of Udayana, edited by Pandit Jîvânanda Vidyâsâgara; Calcutta, 1873.

Bhâmatî of Vâcaspatimis'ra; Bib. Ind., 1880.

Bhartṛihari's *S'atakatraya*, with Com.; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, Bombay, S'aka 1813.

Bhâshâpariccheda, with Com.; edited by L. N. Vasâka, Calcutta, 1871.

Bhedadhikkâra of Nṛisiṃhâs'rama Muni; Benares Sanskrit Series, 1904.

Brahmasûtrabhâṣya of S'ankarâcârya, with Ânandagiri's Com.; Ânandâs'rama Press, 2 vols, 1890-1. Translation by Dr. G. Thibaut in Sacred Books of East Series; 2 vols, 1890-6. A *fine* edition of the Bhâṣya, with the *Bhâmatî*, and two other Commentaries, was issued from the Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, in one volume, in 1904.

Brahmasûtratâtparyavivaraṇa, published in The Paṇḍit for 1882.

Bṛihadâraṇyakopaniṣadbhâṣyavârtika of Sures'varâcârya, with Ânandagiri's ṭîkâ, and full Index to verses; Ânandâs'rama Press, 2 vols, 1892-4. This is sometimes quoted as the large Vârtika.

Citsukhî of Citsukhamuni, with his own vṛitti; published in the Paṇḍit for 1882-3.

Dhvanyâloka of Ânandavardhana, with Abhinavagupta's ṭîkâ; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1891.

Gaṇaratnamahodadhi of Vardhamâna; edited by Prof. Eggeling, 1879-81. Index much needed.

Haṭhayogapradîpikâ of Svâtmârâm, with Brahmânanda's ṭîkâ; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, S'aka 1811.

History of Indian Literature, by Prof. Dr. Weber; Trübner's Oriental Series, 1878.

History of Sanskrit Literature, by Prof. A. A. Macdonell, London, 1900.

Jaimini's *Mîmâṃsâsûtra*, with S'abara's Bhâṣya; 2 vols. Bib. Ind., 1873-89.

Jîvanmuktiviveka of Vidyâraṇya; Ânandâs'rama Series, S'aka 1811.

Kâmasûtra of Vâtsyâyana; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1891.

Kathâsaritsâgara of Somadevabhaṭṭa; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1887. Translation by Prof. C. H. Tawney, 2 vols., Bib. Ind., 1880-4.

Kâvyâdars'a of Daṇḍin; Bib. Ind., 1863.

Kâvyâlankâra of Rudraṭa, with Namisâdhu's ṭîkâ; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1886.

Kâvyapradîpa of Govinda, with Vaidyanâtha's ṭîkâ; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1891.

Kâvyaprakâs'a of Mammaṭa and Allaṭa; edited by Mahes'acandra Nyâyaratna, Calcutta, 1866.

Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya of S'rîharṣa, with S'ankaramis'ra's ṭîkâ; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1888. A new edition of this work, with the Com. entitled *Vidyâsâgarî*, is now appearing in the Chaukhambâ Sanskrit Series, Benares, edited by Prof. Gangânâtha Jhâ who is also issuing a translation in the new Magazine *Indian Thought*.

Khaṇḍanoddhâra, a criticism of the above, by Vâcaspati (not the celebrated philosopher, but a modern writer of about three centuries ago–so the learned Paṇḍit Govind Dâs of Benares tells me); Medical Hall Press, Benares. Incomplete.

Kusumânjali of Udayana, with his own vṛitti, and two ṭîkâs;

2 vols, Bib. Ind., 1890-95. The kârikâs of the same, with Haridâsa's ṭîkâ, edited and translated by Prof. Cowell; Calcutta, 1864.

Kuvalayânanda of Appaidîkṣita, with Vaidyanâtha's ṭîkâ, edited by Paṇḍit J. Vidyâsâgara; Calcutta, S'aka 1796. A very faulty edition. But an excellent one of the same two works, was published at the Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, in 1903.

Laukikanyâyasangraha of Raghunâthavarman; India office MS. 700. An *inaccurate* edition was published at the Medical Hall Press, Benares, in 1902.

Mâgha's *S'is'upâlavadha* with Mallinâtha's comment, edited by Târânâth Tarkavâcaspati; Calcutta, S'aka 1769.

Mahâbhârata, 4 vols, Calcutta 1834-39. Also an oblong edition with Nîlkaṇṭha Govind's ṭîkâ; Gaṇpat Kṛishnâjî's Press, Bombay, S'aka 1799.

Mahâbhâṣya of Patanjali, edited by Dr. Kielhorn; 3 vols, Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1880-85. A new edition is now in course of publication; and let us hope that the learned editor will add *a complete index.*

Manusmṛiti with 7 Commentaries; edited by Râo Sâhib V. N. Maṇḍlik, Bombay, 1886.

Manual of Hindu Pantheism, by Colonel Jacob; Trübner's Oriental Series, 3rd edition, 1891. This edition was *reprinted* by the publishers, about two years ago, without the author's knowledge, and therefore without the revision necessary to bring it up to date.

Molesworth's *Marâṭhi-English Dictionary*; 2nd. edition, Bombay, 1857.

Mṛicchakaṭikanâṭaka, edited by N. B. Goḍbole; Bombay, 1896. Translation by Dr. Ryder; Harvard Oriental Series, 1905.

Mudrârâkṣasanâṭaka with Ḍhunḍhirâja's ṭikâ, edited by K. T. Telang; Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1884.

Naiṣkarmyasiddhi of Sures'vara, with the comment of Jnânottama; edited by Colonel Jacob, 2nd. edition, Bombay, 1906.

b

Nîtisâra of Kâmandaki, with ṭikâ; Bib. Ind., 1884.

Nyâyabinduṭîkâ of Dharmottara, edited by Prof. P. Peterson; Bib. Ind., 1889.

Nyâyakandalî of S'rîdhara, with the text of Pras'astapâda's *Vais'eṣikabhâṣya*; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1895. It is a lamentable thing that this fine series has come to a premature end. A translation of both works is now appearing in the Paṇḍit.

Nyâyakaṇikâ, a Commentary by Vâcaspatimis'ra on Maṇḍanamis'ra's *Vidhiviveka,* with which it is now being published in the Paṇḍit.

Nyâyamakaranda of Ânandabodha, with comment by Citsukha Muni; Chaukhambâ Sanskrit Series, Benares. Incomplete.

Nyâyamanjarî of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1895.

Nyâyasiddhântadîpa of S'eṣadharâcârya, with comment of S'eṣânanta; in course of publication in Paṇḍit.

Nyâyavârtika of Uddyotakara; Bib. Ind., 1907. The first fasciculus was issued in 1887; the title page, this year!

Nyâyavârtikatâtparyaṭîkâ of Vâcaspatimis'ra; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1895. Often quoted as *Tâtparyaṭîkâ.* When are we going to have an edition of Udayana's *Paris'uddhi?*

Padamanjarî, a Commentary on *Kâs'ikâvṛitti*; published in the Paṇḍit, 2 vols.

Pancadas'î of Vidyâraṇya, with Râmkṛishṇa's comment; edited by Paṇḍit J. Vidyâsâgara, Calcutta, 1882.

Pancapâdikâ of Padmapâda; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1891. Said to be the oldest comment on S'ankara's bhâṣya (sûtras 1-4 only).

A translation of the first 14 pages of this work, by Mr. Arthur Venis, was published in the Paṇḍit, but then, alas! it ceased!

Pancatantra, edited by Professors Bühler and Kielhorn; Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1885.

Paris'iṣṭaparvan of Hemacandra, edited by Prof. H. Jacobi; Bib. Ind., 1891.

Practical Sanskrit Dictionary by V. S. Âpṭe; Poona, 1890.

Prasannarâghava Nâṭaka of Jayadeva; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1893.

Râjataranginî of Kalhaṇa, edited by Paṇḍit Durgâprasâd; Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1892-96.

Râmâyaṇa of Vâlmîki; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 2 vols, 1888.

Rasagangâdhara of Jagannâth Paṇḍit, with Nâges'a Bhaṭṭa's ṭîkâ; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1888.

Rational Refutation of Hindu Philosophical Systems, by N. S'âstrî Goreh, translated from the Hindî by Dr. Fitzedward Hall; Calcutta, 1862.

Ṣaḍdars'anacintanikâ of Mahâdeo Moreshwar Kunte, in Sanskrit, Marâṭhi and English; Poona, 1877-82. Incomplete.

Ṣaḍdars'anasamuccaya of Haribhadrasûri, with the comment of Maṇibhadra; Chaukhambâ Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1905. About half of the chapter on Jainism is found, word for word, in the *Syâdvâdamanjarî*! Which was the plagiarist, this man or Malliṣeṇa?

S'ankaravijaya of Ânandagiri; Bib. Ind., 1868.

Sânkhyasûtravṛitti of Aniruddha, with Extracts from Vedantin Mahâdeva's Commentary, edited and translated by Dr. R. Garbe; Bib. Ind., 1888 and 1892.

Sânkhyatattvakaumudi of Vâcaspatimis'ra, edited by Paṇḍit Târânâth Tarkavâcaspati; Calcutta, 1871.

Sankṣhepas'ârîraka of Sarvajnâtma Muni; *The Paṇḍit,* vols., IV–X. New Series.

Saptapadârthî of S'ivâditya, with comment by Mâdhava Sarasvati; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1893.

Sarvadars'anasangraha of Mâdhava; Bib. Ind., 1858. An edition by Jivânanda Vidyâsâgara, Calcutta, 1871. Translation by Professors Cowell and Gough, in Trübner's Oriental Series, 1882. This, too, was reprinted by the publishers, without the much-needed revision. An edition of the Text, with an additional chapter on S'ankara's system, and the text of Madhusûdana Sarasvati's *Prasthânabheda*, was published at the Ânandâs'rama Press in 1906.

S'âstradîpikâ of Pàrthasârathi Mis'ra; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1891.

Satyavrata Sâmas'rami's *Nyâyâvali*; Calcutta, 1875.

Siddhântales'a of Appaidîkṣita; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1890. A translation by Mr. Arthur Venis is being published in *the Paṇḍit.* So far, it extends to page 47 only of the text. I hope my learned friend will carry this on to completion; for his renderings and critical notes are always of the highest value.

Syâdvâdamanjarî, a Commentary by Malliṣeṇa on Hemacandra's verses entitled *Vîtarâgastuti*; Chaukhambâ Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1900. This work is wrongly described by Râjendralâl Mitra, in his *Notices of Sanskrit Mss.* vol. iv, page 87, as "A Commentary *in verse*," and ascribed to Gaganadinamaṇi. See the remarks, above, on *Ṣaḍdars'anasamuccaya.*

Taittirîyopaniṣadbhâṣyavârtika of Sures'varâcârya, with Ânandajnâna's ṭîkâ; Ânandâs'rama Press, S'aka 1811.

Tantravârtika of Kumârila; Benares Sanskrit Series, 1903. Prof. Gangânâtha Jhâ is bringing out a translation of this important work in the Bibliotheca Indica Series. He has already, through the same channel, published a complete translation of the first volume of Kumârila's work, the S'lokavârtika.

Târkikarakṣâ of Varadarâja, with the Commentary (in part) of Mallinâtha; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1903.

Tattvamuktâkalâpa of Venkaṭnâtha, with his own comment; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1900. In the Sarvadars'ana-sangraha it is quoted as *Tattvamuktâvali.*

Udânam, a Buddhist work, published by Pâli Text Society, 1885.

Upamitibhavaprapancâ Kathâ of Siddharṣi, edited by Professors Peterson and Jacobi; Bib. Ind., 1899-1907. Incomplete.

Upades'asâhasrî of S'ankarâcârya, with Râmatîrtha's ṭîkâ; edited by Kṛishṇa S'âstrî Navare, Bombay, 1886.

Vâcaspatyam, a Sanskrit Lexicon, of 5442 pages, by Paṇḍit Târânâtha Tarkavâcaspati, Calcutta. It is very full up to the end of प (page 4550), whilst the rest of the alphabet is squeezed into 900 pages! It is said that the Bengal Govt., which largely subsidized the undertaking, ordered it to be curtailed. If that is so, it did a very unwise thing! We ought to store up the knowledge of these old Pandits who are fast dying out!

Vedântakalpataru of Amalânanda, a commentary on the Bhâmatî; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1895-7.

Vedântakalpataruparimala of Appaidîksita; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1895-8. Sometimes quoted as *Parimala.*

Vedântasâra of Sadânanda, with the commentaries of Nṛisiṃha-sarasvati and Râmatîrtha; edited by Colonel Jacob, and published at Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1894. For the translation of the same, see *Manual of Hindu Pantheism.*

Vedântasiddhântamuktâvali of Prakâs'ânanda, edited and translated by Prof. Arthur Venis; Benares, 1890.

Vidvanmaṇḍana of Viṭṭhala Upâdhâya, edited by Ratnagopâla; Victoria Press, Benares, 1904. In Hall's *Index* this is described as "Strictures on the expositions of several expositors of the Vedânta doctrine." It ascribes to the same author a work entitled *Bhaktihetunirṇaya.*

Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha of Vidyâraṇya; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1893. A translation by Dr. Thibaut is now appearing in the new Review, *Indian Thought.*

c

Yas'astilaka of Somadeva, with S'rîs'rutasâgara's ṭîkâ; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 2 vols. 1901-3.

Yogasûtra with Vyâsa's bhâṣhya and Vâcaspatimis'ra's ṭîkâ, edited by Râjârâm S'âstrî Boḍas; Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1892.

Yogavârtika of Vijnâna Bhikṣu; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1884.

Yogavâsiṣṭha with the Commentary of Ânandabodhendra Saraswati; Gaṇpat Kṛishṇâjî's Press, Bombay. This ought to be printed in modern style. The huge oblong tomes are most difficult to handle.

ERRATA.

Page 36, line 7 from bottom. For "virtully" say "virtually".

A HANDFUL OF POPULAR MAXIMS.

अजाकृपाणीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the she-goat and the sword.* It is founded on some story of a goat's being suddenly killed by accidental contact with a sword, and is used to illustrate any surprising event happening altogether by chance. It therefore belongs to the same class as काकतालीय, खल्वाटबिल्वीय and others of a similar kind. An excellent illustration of its use is found on page 229 of S'rîharsha's *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya*:—"पाणौ पञ्च वराटकान्पिधाय कश्चित्पृच्छति कति वराटका इति । पृष्टश्चाजाकृपाणीयन्यायेन ब्रवीति पञ्चेति" ॥ In a footnote the maxim is thus explained:—"कण्डूयनार्थं स्तंभादौ शिथिलबन्धखड्गे छागी ग्रीवां प्रसारयति यदृच्छया च ग्रीवा छिद्यते तथाभूतोऽजाकृपाणीयन्यायः काकतालीयन्यायसमः" ॥ Vardhamâna puts it differently in his comment on *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 196:—"यथाजया भूमिं खनन्त्यात्मवधाय कृपाणो दर्शितस्तत्तुल्यं वृत्तं केनचिदात्मविनाशाय कृतमजाकृपाणीयम्" ॥ For another variety, see *Padamañjarî* on *Kâs'ikâ* 5. 3. 106.

The nyâya, with the same illustration, is found also in the *Khaṇḍanoddhâra*, page 52; and the illustration, *without* the nyâya, in *Siddhântales'a*, page 95. Then on page 96, it is again referred to in the expression "काकतालीयसंवादिवराटकसंख्याविशेषाहार्यज्ञानवत्. "

It is interesting to note that the Marâṭhî-speaking folk of Western India have adopted the maxim, but with a changed meaning. Molesworth defines it as "The maxim of the sword upon the neck of the goat. Expressive of meekness and absolute helplessness."

अन्तर्दीपिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a lamp in a central position.* Applied to something which fulfils a double purpose. It occurs in S'ankara's bhâshya on the *Muṇḍaka Upanishad* 3. 1. 5. ("सत्येन लभ्यस्तपसा ह्येष आत्मा सम्यग्ज्ञानेन ब्रह्मचर्येण नित्यम् " ।) on which he says:—"नित्यं सर्वदा। नित्यं सत्येन नित्यं तपसा नित्यं सम्यग्ज्ञानेनेति सर्वत्र नित्यशब्दोऽन्तर्दीपिकान्यायेनानुषक्तव्यः " ॥ It is akin to देहलीदीपन्याय and मध्यदीपन्याय. Jîvânanda's edition of the *Muṇḍakabhâshya* reads अन्त्यदीपकन्यायेन. The reading given above is from the Ânandâs'rama edition.

अन्धकवर्तकीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the blind man and the quail.* Like अजाकृपाणीय and many others, it is used to express a wholly fortuitous occurrence. Vardhamâna, on *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 195, explains it thus:—" अन्धकश्च वर्तका च अन्धकवर्तकम् । अन्धकस्य वर्तकाया उपर्यतर्कितः पादन्यास उच्यते । तत्तुल्यमन्धकवर्तकीयम् " ॥ This authority brings the quail under the blind man's *foot*; but the commentator S'rîs'rutasâgara, who expounded the work *Yas'astilaka,** and who in the colophon is described as " तर्कव्याकरणछन्दोलंकारसिद्धान्तसाहित्यादिशास्त्रनिपुणमतिः प्राकृतव्याकरणाद्यनेकशास्त्ररचनाचुञ्चुः, " brings the bird into the man's *hands.* And, surely, such a prodigy of learning *must* be right! The verse in which the expression अन्धकवर्तकीय occurs is *Yas'astilaka* ii. 153. "संसारसागरमिमं भ्रमता नितान्तं जीवेन मानवभवः समवापि दैवात् । तत्रापि यत्भुवनमान्यकुले प्रसूतिः सत्सङ्गतिश्च तदिहान्धकवर्तकीयम्" ॥ "It is altogether by chance that a soul wandering about in this ocean of repeated births is born as a man; and that he should be born into a family of repute in the world, and enjoy the society of the good, is likewise as accidental as in the case of the blind man and the

---

* This important work, described by Dr. Peterson at considerable length in his Second Report, was published in the *Kâvyamâlâ*, a valuable periodical issued by the Proprietor of the Nirṇayasâgar Press.

quail." S'rîs'rutasâgara's explanation of the last term is as follows:—" अन्धकवर्तकीयो दृष्टान्तः । यथा कश्चिदन्धकः पुमान् करतलेन करं ताडयन्वर्तते तस्य करद्वयमध्ये वर्तकः पक्षिविशेषः समायाति स तु दुर्लभस्तथा मानवभवे सत्सङ्गतिर्दुर्लभा वर्तते " ॥

अन्धगजन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the blind men and the elephant.* A number of blind men desired to form an idea of the shape of an elephant. One touched his trunk and thought he must be like a snake; another took hold of a leg and supposed that he was like a post, and so on. Târânâtha tells us that it is used to illustrate the divergence of views held by the ignorant in regard to Îs'vara.

The story is found in the Buddhist work *Udânam* (vi. 4, pages 66-69) published by the Pâli Text Society in 1885.

It is referred to in Sures'vara's large *Vârtika* 4. 4. 566 (page 1813) as follows:—" एकमेवैकरूपं सद्ब्रह्मस्वज्ञातं निरञ्जनम् । जात्यन्धगजदृष्ट्येव कोटिशः कल्प्यते मृषा " ॥ Also in his *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* ii. 93:— "तदेतदद्वयं ब्रह्म निर्विकारं कुबुद्धिभिः । जात्यन्धगजदृष्ट्येव कोटिशः परिकल्प्यते " ॥ I have met with the nyâya again on pages 107 and 160 of *Syâdvâdamanjarî.* It occurs also in the Jainadars'ana of *Saḍdars'anasamuccaya* (page 46); but the passage in which it is found was taken *verbatim* from Malliṣeṇa's work, without any acknowledgment.

अन्धगोलाङ्गूलन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the blind man and the cow's tail.* The story is that an evil-disposed fellow found a blind man who, having lost his way, was wandering about helplessly. Expressing great sympathy for him, and promising to help him, the man led him to a young and frisky cow, and putting her tail into his hand told

him to hold on, and that she would certainly lead him to the village to which he wished to go. The result was, of course, most disastrous.

S'ankara, in his bhâshya on *Vedântasûtra* 1. 1. 7, applies the maxim to the case of a teacher who wrongly instructs his pupil in regard to emancipation and so leads him to destruction! These are his words:— "यदि चाज्ञस्य सतो मुमुक्षोरचेतनमात्मानमात्मेत्युपदिशेत्प्रमाणभूतं शास्त्रं स श्रद्दधानतयान्धगोलाङ्गूलन्यायेन तदात्मदृष्टिं न परित्यजेत्तद्व्यतिरिक्तं चात्मानं न प्रतिपद्येत तथा सति पुरुषार्थाद्विहन्येतानर्थं च ऋच्छेत्" ॥ The nyâya is found, too, in *Pancapâdikâvivaraṇa*, page 170.

अन्धपरम्परान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a continuous series of blind men.* It would seem to be in this sense that S'ankarâchârya uses it in his *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 2. 2. 30, 37. The passages stand thus:— "अनादित्वेऽप्यन्धपरम्परान्यायेनाप्रतिष्ठैवानवस्था व्यवहारलोपिनी स्यान्नाभिप्रायसिद्धिः"।"वर्तमानकालवदतीतेष्वपि कालेष्वितरेतराश्रयदोषाविशेषादन्धपरम्परान्यायापत्तेः" ॥ In his rendering of the former passage, Dr. Thibaut has overlooked the maxim, but the latter he translates as follows:—"For in past time as well as in the present, mutual interdependence of the two took place, so that the beginningless series is like *an endless chain of blind men leading other blind men.*" I should add that, in the former case, S'ankara is arguing against the Buddhist theory of a beginningless series of mental impressions, and, in the latter, against the Sânkhya notion of a similar chain of human actions and divine interpositions. Dr. Thibaut's explanation of the maxim is quite in accord with that of Dr. Garbe in his rendering of the *Sânkhyasûtra* iii. 81 "इतरथान्धपरम्परा" "Else there would be a tradition [comparable to a row] of blind men [leading each other]."

A very apt quotation from one of Coleridge's *Lay Sermons* is given in that useful work *A Rational Refutation of Hindu Philosophical Systems* (now quite out of print), from which I

extract the following:—"The old man talked much and vehemently concerning an infinite series of causes and effects, which he explained to be a string of blind men, the last of whom caught hold of the skirt of the one before him, he of the next, and so on till they were all out of sight; and that they all walked infallibly straight, without making one false step, though all were alike blind. Methought I borrowed courage from surprise, and asked him, 'Who, then, is at the head to guide them?' He looked at me with ineffable contempt, not unmixed with an angry suspicion and then replied, "No one; the string of blind men goes on for ever without any beginning, for although one blind man cannot move without stumbling, yet infinite blindness supplies the want of sight."

In the opening part of the *Padamañjarî* (*Paṇḍit* x. 248) we find the expression अन्धपरम्पराप्रसङ्ग used with reference to testimony received through a series of blind men, and therefore of doubtful value. It is part of an interesting discussion regarding different forms of a word, why some are considered correct and others not. "तत्र ये साधवस्ते शास्त्रेणानुशिष्यन्तेऽसाधुभ्यो विविक्ताः प्रकृतिप्रत्ययविभागेन ज्ञाप्यन्त इमे साधव इति। कथं पुनरिदमाचार्येण पाणिनिनावगतमेते साधव इति। आपिशलेन पूर्वव्याकरणेन। आपिशलिना तर्हि केनावगतम्। ततः पूर्वेण व्याकरणेन। यद्येवमन्धपरम्पराप्रसङ्गः। तद्यथा शुक्लं क्षीरमित्यन्धेनोक्ते केनेदमवगतमिति पृष्टो यदान्धान्तरं मूलं निर्दिशति सोऽप्यन्धान्तरं तदा नैतद्वचः शौक्ल्ये प्रमाणं भवति तादृगेतत्" ॥

That the nyâya is in very general use will be apparent from the following additional references. *Tantravârtika,* pages 11, 72, 75, 232, 799, 877. *Pancapâdikâ,* page 98. *Bhâmatî,* pages 254, 464. *Nyâyamanjarî* pages 234, 249, 251, 425, 492.

अरुन्धतीप्रदर्शनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the pointing out of the star Arundhatî.* The idea here is that of gradual instruction, on the principle of the अध्यारोपापवादन्याय for which see the Second Handful. Its

usage is explained by S'ankara in *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 1. 1. 8, as follows:—" यथारुन्धतीं दिदर्शयिषुस्तत्समीपस्थां स्थूलां तारामुख्यां प्रथममरुन्धतीति ग्राहयित्वा तां प्रत्याख्याय पश्चादरुन्धतीमेव ग्राहयति तद्वन्नायमात्मेति ब्रूयात् " ॥ Similarly, too, in 1. 1. 12, we read:—"यथारुन्धतीनिदर्शने बह्वीष्वपि तारास्वमुख्यास्वरुन्धतीषु दर्शितासु यान्त्या प्रदर्श्यते सा मुख्यैवारुन्धती भवत्येवमिहाप्यानन्दमयस्य सर्वान्तरत्वान्मुख्यमात्मत्वम्" ॥ The maxim is sometimes styled स्थूलारुन्धतीन्याय, and it appears under this name in Nṛisiṁhasarasvatî's commentary on section 20 of the *Vedântasâra*—that section which gives the views of Chârvâkas and others as to the *âtman*.

अर्के चेन्मधु विन्देत किमर्थं पर्वतं व्रजेत् ॥

If one can find honey on the Arka-tree [close at hand] *then why go to the mountain for it?* That is, if an object can be accomplished by simple means, don't adopt a more complicated method. This is well illustrated by S'ankara in his *Vedânta-sûtrabhâshya* 3. 4. 3, as follows:—" केवलाच्चेज्ज्ञानात्पुरुषार्थसिद्धिः स्यात्किमर्थमनेकायाससमन्वितानि कर्माणि ते कुर्युः। अर्के चेन्मधु विन्देत किमर्थं पर्वतं व्रजेदिति न्यायात्" ॥

Its source, however, is S'abara on *Jaimini* 1. 2. 4. Here, the *pûrvapakshin,* after taking exception to certain Vedic injunctions as useless says:—" तद्यथा पथि जातेऽर्के मधूत्सृज्य तेनैव पथा मध्वर्थिनः पर्वतं न गच्छेयुस्तादृशं हि तत्। अपि चाहुः । अर्के चेन्मधु विन्देत किमर्थं पर्वतं व्रजेत् । इष्टस्यार्थस्य संसिद्धौ को विद्वान्यत्नमाचरेत्" ॥ The same couplet is quoted by Aniruddha in his comment on *Sâṅkhyasûtra* i. 1; also by Vâchaspati Mis'ra in his *Sânkhya-tattvakaumudî* 1., and again in his *Nyâyavârtikatâtparyaṭîkâ,* page 220. Instead of अर्के, however, we have in the former instance अक्के and in the latter अक्के. Raghunâth reads अक्के and explains it by गृहकोणे. One more example of the application of this nyâya may be found in Kumârila's *Tantravârtika* 1.2.17:—

"यद्यल्पान्महतश्च कर्मणः समं फलं जायेत ततोऽर्के चेन्मधु विन्देतेत्यनेनैव न्यायेनाल्पेन सिद्धे महति न कश्चित्प्रवर्तेत" ॥

अर्धजरतीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the semi-senile woman.* It is very difficult to fix on the exact force of this saying. Authorities differ so much as to make it almost an instance of *quot homines tot sententiæ.* As expounded by Vardhamâna (iii. 195) it seems to imply *indefiniteness, half-and-half-ness, the being neither one thing nor the other.* He says:—"यथा स्त्री न तरुणी श्लथस्तनत्वात् कृष्णकेशत्वान्न जरती वक्तुं शक्यते तद्वत्सिद्धासिद्धं प्रयोजनम्" ॥ This seems to accord with the meaning assigned to it by Marâṭhas, as shown by Molesworth in his Marâthî dictionary where he defines it as "Action of indeterminate character; speech vague and indefinite; a proceeding void of decided leaning or bearing."

The maxim is cited by S'ankara in *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 1. 1. 19, and again in 1. 2. 8. In the former, after quoting *Taittirîya-upanishad* ii. 1–4 in regard to अन्नरसमय, प्राणमय &c. he says:—"इति विकारार्थे मयट्प्रवाहे सत्यानन्दमय एवाकस्मादर्धजरतीयन्यायेन कथमिव मयटः प्राचुर्यार्थत्वं ब्रह्मविषयत्वं चाश्रीयत इति" ॥ The commentators Ânandagiri and Râmânanda (erroneously styled Govindânanda*) ignore the maxim entirely, and so does Dr. Thibaut in his translation. In the second instance, S'ankara says:—"यथाशास्त्रं तर्हि शास्त्रीयोऽर्थः प्रतिपत्तव्यो न तत्रार्धजरतीयं लभ्यम्," which is rendered by Dr. Thibaut, "Very well, then, it appears that the truth about scriptural matters is to be ascertained from scripture, and that *scripture is not sometimes to be appealed to and on other occasions to be disregarded.*" Ânandagiri's comment is:—"न हि कुक्कुटादेरेकदेशो भोगाय पच्यत एकदेशस्तु प्रसवाय कल्प्यते विरोधात्", "You cannot take one part of a fowl for cooking and leave the other part to lay eggs;" that is, you must take a

---

* See Dr. Fitzedward Hall's *Index,* page 90.

thing in its entirety, or else leave it altogether. Râmânanda, on the other hand, says:—"अर्धं मुखमात्रं जरत्या वृद्धायाः कामयते नाङ्गानीति सोऽयमर्धजरतीयन्यायः स चात्र न युक्तः," which seems to be based on Patanjali's words "न चेदानीमर्धजरतीयं लभ्यं··· । तद्यथा । अर्धं जरत्याः कामयतेऽर्धं नेति", as found in *Mahâbhâshya* 4. 1. 78.* Again we find the maxim in the Bauddha section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 14 of Bib. Ind., and 17 of Jîvânanda's edn.), which reads thus:—"न चार्धजरतीयमुचितम् । न हि कुक्कुट्या एको भागः पाकायापरो भागः प्रसवाय कल्प्यतामिति कल्प्यते", and which is identical with Ânandagiri's exposition. Prof. Gough, who translated this chapter, rendered the maxim by "semi-effete"—"Nor is a semi-effete existence admissible."

Another excellent illustration of the usage of this nyâya is given in the following passage of the *Brahmasûtratâtparyavivaraṇa* 3. 4. 26. (The Paṇdit vol. vi. page 220):—" ब्रह्मविद्या स्वफले कर्माणि नापेक्षते तथा स्वोत्पत्तावपि नापेक्षते । अन्यथा क्वचिदपेक्षा क्वचिन्नेत्यर्धजरतीयत्वापत्तिरिति प्राप्ते आह सर्वापेक्षेति । नार्धजरतीयन्यायो योग्यतावशादेवैकस्यैव कार्यविशेषेष्वपेक्षानपेक्षयोरुपपत्तेः । यथा लाङ्गलवहनेऽनपेक्षितोऽश्वो रथवहनेऽपेक्ष्यते तद्वत्स्वोत्पत्तौ तु विद्या कर्मापेक्षते" ॥

Other references are the following:—*Saptapadârthî*, page 26. *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, page 21. *Nyâyamanjarî*, pages 248, 249. *Advaitabrahmasiddhi*, page 340.

अशक्तोऽहं गृहारम्भे शक्तोऽहं गृहभञ्जने ॥

I am too weak to construct a house, but I am well able to destroy one. This is found in Ḍhuṇḍhirâja's commentary on *Mudrârâkshasa* iii. 11. Châṇakya says—"कथं स्पर्द्धते मया सह दुरात्मा राक्षसः" । and then follows the verse "कृतागाः कौटिल्यो भुजग

* Vol. ii. page 231 of the edition by Dr. F. Kielhorn, who himself most kindly gave me the reference.

इव निर्याय नगरात् &c.," on which Dhuṇḍhirâja remarks:—"ममेव नास्य बुद्धिबलं परंतु मत्सरमात्रेण अशक्तोऽहं गृहारम्भे शक्तोऽहं गृहभञ्जन इति न्यायेन मौर्योपकारमात्राय प्रयतमानः सन्केवलं पौरुषबलमवष्टभ्य मद्बुद्धेः प्रकर्षमतिशयितुं व्यवसित इत्यहो राक्षसस्य दुर्व्यवसितमिति" ॥ I am indebted for this passage to the late learned Librarian at the India Office, C. H. Tawney Esqr., who has also pointed out to me *Pancatantra* i. 363 as illustrating the nyâya.

The verse reads thus:—

" घातयितुमेव नीचः परकार्यं वेत्ति न प्रसाधयितुम् ।
पातयितुमेव शक्तिर्नाखोरुद्धर्तुमन्नपिटम् " ॥

अशोकवनिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the grove of As'oka trees.* Âpṭe says "Râvaṇa kept Sîtâ in the grove of As'oka trees, but it is not easy to account for his preference of that particular grove to any other one; so when a man finds several ways of doing a thing, any one of them may be considered as good as another, and the preference of any particular one cannot be accounted for." For the As'oka-grove see *Râmâyaṇa* 1. 1. 73. The only example of this nyâya that I have met with is in S'esânanta's ṭîkâ on S'as'adhara's *Nyâyasiddhântadîpa*, page 11. This work was commenced in the Paṇḍit for April 1903, but is still incomplete.

अश्मलोष्टन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the stone and clod of earth.* Âpṭe, following the *Vâcaspatyam*, explains it thus:—"A clod may be considered to be hard when compared with cotton, but is soft as compared with a stone. So a person may be considered to be very important as compared with his inferiors, but sinks into insignificance when compared with his betters." Târânâtha adds that when it is intended to indicate that there is *very little* difference between two things or persons compared, the kindred

maxim पाषाणेष्टकान्याय is used. With these Âpṭe compares the Marâṭhî proverb "दगडापेक्षां वीट मऊ" "Brick is softer than stone." The sense, however, is not quite the same; for, according to Molesworth, the Marâṭhî saying is used "in ironical softening of a difficulty or hardship but *barely* surmountable or sufferable, by comparing it with a matter *utterly* impracticable or intolerable."

Is it not much more likely however that the maxim is based on *Bṛihadâraṇyaka Upanishad* 1. 3. 7, "यथाश्मानमृत्वा लोष्टो विध्वंसेत" which S'ankara expounds thus:—"यथा लोकेऽश्मानं पाषाणमृत्वा गत्वा प्राप्य लोष्टः पांसुपिण्डः पाषाणचूर्णनायाश्मनि निक्षिप्तः स्वयं विध्वंसेत विस्रंसेत विचूर्णीभवेत्" ? This is referred to in *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 3. 3. 6. as the "अश्मलोष्टनिदर्शन" and it seems to remind one of the Scripture saying "Whosover shall fall upon that stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder."

अस्त्रमस्त्रेण शाम्यति ॥

A weapon is silenced by a weapon. Perhaps analogous to the saying "Diamond cuts diamond," or, "Set a thief to catch a thief." It occurs in Jnânottama's commentary on Sures'vara's *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* i. 81, where he says:—"नन्वस्त्रमस्त्रेण शाम्यतीति न्यायेन काम्यैः काम्यानां निषिद्धैर्निषिद्धानां निवृत्तिरस्त्वित्यत आह न च काम्यैरिति" ॥

Compare with this *Nîtisâra* viii. 67 :—

"विषं विषेण व्यथते वज्रं वज्रेण भिद्यते ।
गजेन्द्रो दृष्टसारेण गजेन्द्रेणैव बध्यते" ॥

अस्नेहदीपन्यायः ॥

The simile of *a Lamp without oil* [that is, from which the oil has burnt out]. Raghunâthavarma explains it thus:— " अस्मिंश्चाध्यासेऽज्ञानं कारणम् । तत्त्वज्ञानेन वातदीपन्यायेन तन्निवृत्तावस्नेहदीपन्यायेन तदध्यासोऽपि निवर्तते । न च ज्ञानेनैवोभयनिवृत्तिः कुतो न

स्यात्। ज्ञानमज्ञानस्यैव निवर्तकमिति न्यायविरोधात्। द्विविधा हि निवृत्ति-र्विरोधिना सामग्रीनिवृत्त्या च। यथा वातादिना दीपनाशो यथा च तैलवर्त्यादि-निवृत्त्या दीपनिवृत्तिः। तत्राद्या निवृत्तिरज्ञानस्य द्वितीया कार्यवर्गस्येति बोध्यम्" ॥

I have met with the following example of the nyâya in *Yogavâsiṣtha* 2. 1. 44, a chapter entitled शुकनिर्याणम्:—

"तत्र वर्षसहस्राणि निर्विकल्पसमाधिना।
दश स्थित्वा शशामासावात्मन्यस्नेहदीपवत्" ॥

For the nyâya ज्ञानमज्ञानस्यैव निवर्तकम् see the *Third Handful of Popular Maxims*; and for निर्विकल्पसमाधि see *Vedântasâra*, pp. 55, 57 &c., and *Manual of Hindu Pantheism*, pages 109, 110.

अहिकुण्डलन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the snake and its coils.* The expression occurs in *Brahmasûtra* 3. 2. 27, and is explained in the *bhâshya.* They read thus:—"उभयव्यपदेशात्त्वहिकुण्डलवत् ॥ ...अत उभयव्यपदेशदर्शनादहिकुण्डलवदत्र तत्त्वं भवितुमर्हति। यथाहिरित्यभेदः कुण्डलाभोगप्रांशुत्वादीनीति च भेद एवमिहापीति" ॥ Dr. Thibaut's translation is as follows:—"But on account of twofold designation, (the relation of the highest Self to the individual soul has to be viewed) like that of the snake to its coils......We therefore look on the relation of the highest Self and the soul as analogous to that of the snake and its coils. Viewed as a whole the snake is one, non-different, while an element of difference appears if we view it with regard to its coils, hood, erect posture and so on." It is akin therefore to the expressions "a forest and its trees," "a lake and its waters," so often used by the Vedantists as illustrations of identity. The explanation given by Târânâtha in the *Vâchaspatyam* does not coincide with the above. He says:—"अहेः सर्पस्य यथा कुण्डलाकृतिवेष्टनं स्वाभाविकं तथा यस्य स्वाभाविकधर्मो व्यपदिश्यते तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥

आकाशमुष्टिहननन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *striking the sky with one's fist.* A vain attempt at an impossibility. It occurs in the Jaimini chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 133 of *Bib. Ind.* edition, and p. 151 of Jîvânanda's) as follows:—"तस्मादुत्पत्तौ ज्ञप्तौ च परतस्त्वे प्रमाणसंभवात्स्वतःसिद्धं प्रामाण्यमित्येतत्पूतिकूष्माण्डायत इति चेत्तदेतदाकाशमुष्टिहननायते" ॥ Prof. Cowell has rendered it thus:—"Therefore, as we can prove that authoritativeness is both produced and recognized by means of something external, the Mîmâmsâ tenet 'authoritativeness is self-proved' is like a gourd over-ripe and rotten. This long harangue of our opponent, however, is but a vain attempt to strike the sky with his fist."

Much older instances of the employment of the nyâya are the following:—*Tantravârtika*, page 170, "यस्तन्तूननुपादाय तुरीमाग्रपरिग्रहात् । पटं कर्तुं समीहेत स हन्याद्व्योम मुष्टिभिः" ॥ [With this compare the words of a great modern preacher–Dr. Maclaren–"Logic without Revelation is like a spinning-machine without cotton, busy drawing out nothing"]. *Pancapâdikâ* page 43, line 19, "तद्यदि नाम ज्ञानं लोके सिद्धं तथापि निरस्तप्रपञ्चात्मविषयमसिद्धमाकाशमुष्टिहननवन्न विधातुं शक्यम्." Then, in *Nyâyakandalî*, page 56, line 6, we find the cognate expression "यथा कश्चिन्निशितं कृपाणमच्छेद्यमाकाशं प्रति व्यापारयन्", and again in *Nyâyakaṇikâ*, page 219.

उपयन्नपयन्धर्मो विकरोति हि धर्मिणम् ॥

The appearance or disappearance of a quality (or characteristic) *produces a corresponding change in the subject of it.* This nyâya is the second line of *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* ii. 35, the first being "आगमापायिनिष्ठत्वादनित्यत्वमियादृशिः" ॥ Although it is included in Raghunâtha's list, it ought not, strictly speaking, to find a place amongst *popular maxims;* but I insert it in order to make a necessary correction in the printed text of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha* where it is quoted. On page 161

of the Bibliotheca Indica edition, and on page 182 of that prepared by Jîvânanda Vidyâsâgara, we read "ततश्चोपपन्नस्त्वयन्धर्मो विकरोति हि धर्मिणमिति न्यायेन" and this bad reading of course affects the translation as it appears on page 244 of the volume prepared for Trübner's Oriental Series by Professors Cowell and Gough. The explication given in *Vâchaspatyam* is as follows:—"यथा पूर्वस्य रूपरसादिरूपधर्मपरावृत्तौ रूपरसाद्यन्तरोत्पत्तौ च घटादेर्धर्मिणो विकृतिरेवं यस्य धर्मिणः पूर्वधर्मस्यापगमेऽन्यधर्मस्योत्पत्तिस्तत्रायं न्यायोऽवतरति" ॥

उष्ट्रकण्टकभक्षणन्यायः—

The maxim of *a camel's eating thorns.* This is not in Raghunâtha's list, but in the *Vâcaspatyam* it is explained thus:—"उष्ट्रस्य शमीकण्टकवेधजातदुःखकालेऽपि शमीपत्रभक्षणसुखलेशो यथा तथाभीष्टविषयोपार्जनदुःखकाले तदुपार्जितद्रव्यजसुखलेशो यत्रोपदिश्यते तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ I regard this, however, as quite beside the mark. In *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 2. 2. 1. S'ankara, after combating at length the Sânkhya theory, that objects are *in themselves* सुखदुःखमोहात्मक, says:—"शब्दाद्यविशेषेऽपि च भावनाविशेषात्सुखादिविशेषोपलब्धेः," which Dr. Thibaut renders—"And, further, although the sense-object, such as sound and so on, is one, yet we observe that owing to the difference of the mental impressions (produced by it) differences exist in the effects it produces, one person being affected by it pleasantly, another painfully, and so on." On which Ânandagiri says:—"शब्दादीति । भावना तत्तज्जातियोग्या वासना तद्विशेषादुष्ट्रादीनां कण्टकादौ सुखादिदर्शनात् &c." Vâcaspatimis'ra, explains the same passage in the *Bhâmatî*, (pp. 380–1), pointing out that things are not *in themselves essentially* pleasant or unpleasant, and that what causes pleasure to one may be painful to another, and that even the same thing which at one time is agreeable may at another time be the reverse. Otherwise thorns would be as acceptable to men as they are to a camel. Here are his words:—"यदि पुनरेत एव सुखदुःखस्वभावा

भवेयुस्ततः स्वरूपत्वाद्धेमन्तेपि चन्दनः सुखः स्यात् । न हि चन्दनः कदाचिद्-चन्दनः । तथा निदाघेष्वपि कुंकुमपंकः सुखो भवेत् । न ह्यसौ कदाचिदकुंकुमपंकः । एवं कण्टकः क्रमेलकस्य सुख इति मनुष्यादीनामपि प्राणभृतां सुखः स्यात् । न ह्यसौ कांश्चित्प्रत्येवाकण्टक* इति । तस्मादसुखादिस्वभावा अपि चन्दनकुंकुमादयो जातिकालावस्थाद्यपेक्षया सुखदुःखादिहेतवो न तु स्वयं सुखादिस्वभावा इति रमणीयम् ". A camel, then, eats thorns because it likes them; a man does not eat them because he does not like them. May not the maxim, therefore, be the equivalent of our *"What's one man's food is another man's poison?"* Mr. M. R. Telang has kindly pointed out *Vikramânkadevacarita* i. 29. as illustrating a camel's love of thorns.

एकमनुसन्धित्सतोऽपरं प्रच्यवते ॥

Whilst seeking for one thing he loses another. The saying appears twice, in this form, in the *Sarvadars'anasangraha.* The first instance is in the Ârhata Section (p. 27 of Bib. Ind. and 33 of Jîvânanda's edn.), translated by Professor Cowell:—"एतद्दोषपरिजिहीर्षया ज्ञानं जडतां नानुकरोतीति ब्रूषे हन्त तर्हि तस्या ग्रहणं न स्यादित्येकमनुसन्धित्सतोऽपरं प्रच्यवत इति न्यायापातः" । "If in your wish to escape this difficulty, you assert that 'the perception does not follow the object in being insentient,' then there would be no perception that the object is insentient, and so it is a case of the proverb, '*While he looks for one thing which he has lost, another drops.*"

The second example, from the Akshapâda section (pp. 118 and 134), is as follows:—"नन्वेकमनुसन्धित्सतोऽपरं प्रच्यवत इति न्यायेन दुःखवत्सुखमित्युच्छिद्यत इत्यकाम्योऽयं पक्ष इति चेन्मैवं मंस्थाः" ।

"Nor may you retort on us that we have fulfilled the proverb of '*seeking one thing and dropping another in the search,*' since we have abolished happiness as being ever tainted with some incidental pain &c."

---

* The printed text wrongly reads कण्टक for अकण्टक.

In the *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya* (page 447) and in Mallinâtha on *Târkikarakṣâ*, pp. 7 and 25, we meet with the nyâya in another form, namely "एकं सन्धित्सतोऽपरं प्रच्यवते" which means " Whilst trying to reunite one [piece of a broken vessel] another falls off."

एकवृन्तगतफलद्वयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *two fruits attached to one stalk.* Used by writers on Alankâra to illustrate a particular kind of *Paronomasia*, namely the coalescence of two meanings under one word. It was first pointed out to me by Mr. F. W. Thomas, Assistant Librarian to the India Office, he having met with it in the commentary on *Kâvyâdars'a* ii. 310. I have since found it in use in the *Alankârasarvasva, Kâvyapradîpa, Sâhityadarpaṇa, Rasagangâdhara, Alankârakaustubha,* and *Sâhityakaumudî,* in each case under the figure श्लेष. The maxim finds a place in Marâṭhî literature also, and is regarded by Molesworth as equivalent to our proverb "Killing two birds with one stone."

कदम्बकोरकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the buds of the Kadamba tree.* They are said to burst forth simultaneously. As, for example, in Hemacandra's *Paris'ishṭaparvan* i. 241:—

"पित्रा स्वपाणिपद्मेन स्पृश्यमानोऽवनीपतिः ।
उत्कोरककदम्बाभो बभूव पुलकांकुरैः" ॥

In the *Nyâyamanjarî,* pages 214 and 228, and in the *Bhâshâparichchheda* (verse 166) this nyâya is given as an illustration of the way in which sound is produced. The last-mentioned reads thus:—

वीचीतरङ्गन्यायेन तदुत्पत्तिस्तु कीर्तिता ।
कदम्बकोरकन्यायादुत्पत्तिः कस्यचिन्मते ॥

The commentary, *Siddhântamuktâvali*, however, explains कदम्बगोलकन्यायात् and this is the form given to the maxim in the *Vâchaspatyam* which explains it as follows:—"कदम्बगोलकस्य गोलाकारकदम्बस्य सर्वावयवेषु यथा युगपत्पुष्पोद्गम एवं सर्वप्रदेशेषु युगपद्यत्र प्रसरस्तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ In Vedantin Mahâdeva's comment on *Sânkhyasûtra* V. 103, we have a third form, namely कदम्बमुकुलन्याय.

कफोणिगुडन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *treacle on the elbow*. Used of something tantalizingly inaccessible. It is found in Udayana's *Âtmatattvaviveka*, page 26:—अस्तु तर्हि भावस्वरूपातिरिक्ता निवृत्तिर्नास्तीत्यस्य सोपाख्येति शेषः । नन्वयमपि क्षणभंगस्योद्धारः स च कफोणिगुडायितो वर्त्तते भवतु वा निवृत्तिरसमर्था तथाप्यहेतुकत्वे तस्याः किमायातम्" ॥ Then in the Akshapâda chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 116 of Bib. Indica, and 132 of Jîvânanda's edition) we read:—"ननु दुःखात्यन्तोच्छेदोऽपवर्ग इत्येतदद्यापि कफोणिगुडायितं वर्तते तत्कथं सिद्धवत्कृत्य व्यवह्रियत इति चेन्मैवम्" ॥ which Prof. Cowell translates as follows:—"But is not your definition of the *summum bonum*, liberation, that is, the absolute abolition of pain, after all as much beyond our reach as *treacle on the elbow is to the tongue*; why then is this continually put forth as if it were established beyond all dispute?" In a footnote he says, "Compare the English proverb 'As soon as the cat can lick her ear.'" In the *Vâchaspatyam*, however, the nyâya is explained as meaning the *absence* of a thing, not its inaccessibility. It says:—"कफोणौ गुडाभावेऽपि तदाशया यथा लेहनमेवं यत्र वस्त्वसद्भावेऽपि तत्प्रत्याशया व्यापारभेदस्तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ The St. Petersburg Lexicon (s. v. कफोणिगुडाय्) renders it "like a *ball* on the elbow."

काकतालीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the crow and the Palmyra fruit.* A crow alighted on a Palmyra tree, and at the same moment some of the fruit fell on its head and killed it. The maxim is therefore used to illustrate a startling and *purely accidental* occurrence. It is well explained in the *Kâs'ikâvṛitti* on *Pâṇini* 5. 3. 106 (as quoted by Dr. Eggeling in a footnote to *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 195):—"काकतालीयम् । अजाकृपाणीयम् । अन्धकवर्तकीयम् । अतर्कितोपनतं चित्रीकरणमुच्यते । तत्कथम् । काकस्यागमनं यादृच्छिकं तालस्य पतनं च । तेन तालेन पतता काकस्य वधः कृतः । एवमेव देवदत्तस्य तत्रागमनं दस्यूनां चोपनिपातः । तैश्च तस्य वधः कृतः । तत्र यो देवदत्तस्य दस्यूनां च समागमः स काकतालसमागमसदृशः" ॥

We find the saying in *Pañchadas'î* ix. 12 as follows:—"अयथावस्तुविज्ञानात्फलं लभ्यत ईप्सितम् । काकतालीयतः सोऽयं संवादिभ्रम उच्यते" ॥ And again in Ânandavardhana's *Dhvanyâloka* ii. 16, and in *Nyâyavârtikatâtparyaṭîkâ*, page 401. There is a capital example of it, too, in the following verses of the *Nyâyamanjarî* (page 106):—"अपि चानागतं ज्ञानमस्मदादेरपि क्वचित् ॥ प्रमाणं प्रातिभं श्वो मे भ्रातागन्तेति दृश्यते ॥ नानर्थजं न सन्दिग्धं न बाधविधुरीकृतम् । न दुष्टकारणं चेति प्रमाणमिदमिष्यताम् ॥ क्वचिद्बाधकयोगश्चेदस्तु तस्याप्रमाणता । यत्रापरेद्युरभ्येति भ्राता तत्र किमुच्यताम् ॥ काकतालीयमिति चेन्न प्रमाणप्रदर्शितम् । वस्तु तत्काकतालीयमिति भवितुमर्हति" ॥ In his commentary on *S'ântiparva* clxxvii. 11, Nîlakaṇtha Govind gives another, and less probable, definition of the maxim. He says:—"तालः करतलयोः शब्दजनकः संयोगस्तस्मिन् क्रियमाणे उत्पतन्काको दैवात्तत्र तालाभ्यामाक्रान्तोऽभूत्तदेतत्काकतालीयमित्युच्यते । काकस्पर्शसमकालं तालफलस्य तालवृक्षस्य वा पतनं तदित्यन्ये" ॥ Molesworth explains it thus:—"Said when any occurrence synchronizing with, or immediately following, some other seems, however in truth independent of it, to have been *occasioned* by it;—as the fruit of a Palmyra falling at the alighting upon it of a crow, may appear to fall *in consequence.*"

काकदन्तपरीक्षान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the examination of a crow's teeth.* Used of any useless and manifestly fruitless enquiry. It occurs in the Buddhist treatise *Nyâyabinduṭîkâ,* page 1, and again on page 3, line 8. Also in S'ankara's bhâshya on *Kaṭha-Upanishad* i. 25 ["नचिकेतो मरणं मानुप्राक्षीः"]:—"नचिकेतो मरणं मरणसंबद्धं प्रश्नं प्रेत्यास्ति नास्तीति काकदन्तपरीक्षारूपं मानुप्राक्षीमैवं प्रष्टुमर्हसि" ॥ We find it too in Abhinavagupta on *Dhvanyâloka* iii. 19 (page 163 of Paṇḍit Durgâprasâda's edition) as follows:—"व्यंग्योऽर्थो भवतु मा वाभूत् कस्तत्राभिनिवेशः । काकदन्तपरीक्षाप्रायमेव तत्स्यादिति भावः" ॥ It appears also in *Pancapâdikâ,* pages 53 and 68, and in many works besides. In *Nyâyamanjarî,* page 7, line 5, it takes the form of वायसदशनविमर्शन्याय.

काकाक्षिगोलकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the crow's eyeball.* Crows are popularly supposed to have only one eye, which, as occasion requires, moves from the cavity on one side into that on the other. The maxim is used of a word which appears only once in a sentence but which applies to two portions of it; or of persons or things fulfilling a double purpose. I have met with it in the former sense in Svâtmârâm's *Haṭhayogapradîpikâ* iv. 10, "विविधैरासनैः कुम्भैर्विचित्रैः करणैरपि," on which the commentator, Brahmânanda, says "विचित्रैरिति काकाक्षिगोलकन्यायेनोभयत्र संबध्यते." Also in Abhinavagupta's comment on *Dhvanyâloka* iii. 1, "पदानां स्मारकत्वेऽपि पदमात्रावभासिनः", where he remarks "अपिशब्दः काकाक्षिन्यायेनोभयत्रापि संबध्यते" ॥ Of its use in the second sense, we have an interesting example in Kâmandaki's *Nîtisâra,* a work ascribed to the third century before Christ. Chapter xi. 24 reads thus:—"बलिनोर्द्विषतोर्मध्ये वाचात्मानं समर्पयन् । द्वैधीभावेन वर्त्तेत काकाक्षिवदलक्षितः."

काशकुशावलम्बनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *catching at straws.* The being driven from one argument or position to another equally untenable. Târânâtha says:—"नद्यादौ पतितस्य संतरणानभिज्ञस्य यथा कुशकाशावलम्बनं निरर्थकमेवं प्रबलयुक्तिषु निराकृतासु दुर्बलयुक्त्यवलम्बनं निरर्थकमित्येवमवलम्बनस्य निरर्थकत्वविवक्षायामस्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ The expression "काशकुशावलम्बनकल्पं" occurs in the Ârhata chapter (p. 25 of Bib. Ind. and p. 31 of Jîvânanda's edition) of the *Sarvadars'ana-sangraha,* and again in the Pâṇini chapter (pp. 142 and 161); and in both places Prof. Cowell has rendered it "like a drowning man's catching at a straw." We have the same, though not as a compound, in *Naishkarmyasiddhi* i. 76,—"एवं निराकृतोऽपि काशं कुशं वावलम्बयाह." It appears also in *Nyâyamanjarî* page 183; and again, as follows, on page 551:—"तस्मात्प्रमाणतोऽशक्ये शक्ये वा वस्तुनिर्णये। एवं प्रायमयुक्तं यत्कुशकाशावलंबनम्" ॥ In *Tantravârtika* 1. 3. 18 (page 213) we have the maxim in the following couplet:—"अर्थवत्त्वं न चेज्जातं मुख्यैर्यस्य प्रयोजनैः। तस्यानुषङ्गिकेष्वाशा कुशकाशावलंबिनी" ॥

In expounding *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 3. 3. 29, Ânandagiri quotes *Amarakos'a* 2. 4 166 (अस्त्री कुशं कुशो दर्भः पवित्रमथ कत्तृणम्) as follows:—"अत एवास्त्री कुशमित्यमरसिंहेनानुशिष्टम्." Does this throw any new light on the date of Amara? In his *History of Indian Literature* (page 230), Professor Weber tells us that the *Amarakos'a* cannot be widely separated from those dictionaries which we know to belong to the eleventh, twelfth, and following centuries; whilst Professor Macdonell, in his recently issued *History of Sanskrit Literature* (page 433) assigns that work to about 500 A. D.

कूपमण्डूकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a frog in a well.* It is applied to an inexperienced person brought up in the narrow circle of home, and

ignorant of public life and mankind. "Home-keeping youth have ever homely wits" (*Two Gentlemen of Verona* i. 1). The following passage from *Prasannarâghava-Nâṭaka* i. (page 13) illustrates the use of the term:—"कथं मामपि दशदिग्विलासिनीकर्णपूरीकृतकीर्तिपल्लवं त्रिभुवनवीरनामधेयं कूपमंडूक इव सागरमविख्यातमपदिशसि" ॥ So, too, *Upamitibhavaprapancâ*, page 828:—

"यो न निर्गत्य निःशेषां विलोकयति मेदिनीम् ।
अनेकाद्भुतवृत्तान्तां स नरः कूपदर्दुरः" ॥

कूपयन्त्रघटिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the pots attached to the water-wheel of a well.* As the wheel revolves, some of the pots are going up and others are going down; some are full whilst others are empty; and so it is applied to illustrate the changes and chances of this mortal life. This is well put in *Mṛichchhakaṭika* x. 60:—

"कांश्चित्तुच्छयति प्रपूरयति वा कांश्चिन्नयत्युन्नतिं
कांश्चित्पातविधौ करोति च पुनः कांश्चिन्नयत्याकुलान् ।
अन्योन्यं प्रतिपक्षसंहतिमिमां लोकस्थितिं बोधय-
न्नेष क्रीडति कूपयन्त्रघटिकान्यायप्रसक्तो विधिः" ॥

Târanâtha's explanation of this maxim is extremely tame, not to say nonsensical! According to him, it is intended to teach that as a pot is raised by the water-wheel from a deep well, so, by means of instruction, the essence of the S'âstras is drawn up, deep though they are by reason of their complexity! See the cognate घटीयन्त्रन्याय in *Second* and *Third Handful.*

कूर्माङ्गन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the limbs of the tortoise.* Its meaning and application will be apparent from the following passage taken from the Sânkhya section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 150 Bib. Ind. and 170 of Jîvânanda's edition):—"यथा हि कूर्म-

स्याङ्गानि कूर्मशरीरे निविशमानानि तिरोभवन्ति निःसरन्ति चाविर्भवन्त्येवं कारणस्य तन्त्वादेः पटादयो विशेषा निःसरन्त आविर्भवन्त उत्पद्यन्त इत्युच्यन्ते निविशमानास्तिरोभवन्तो विनश्यन्तीत्युच्यन्ते । न पुनरसतामुत्पत्तिः सतां वा विनाशः" ॥ Prof. Cowell renders it thus:—"As the limbs of a tortoise, when they retire within its shell, are concealed, and, when they come forth, are revealed, so the particular effects, as cloth &c., of a cause, as threads &c., when they come forth and are revealed, are said to be produced; and when they retire and are concealed, they are said to be destroyed; but there is no such thing as the production of the non-existent, or the destruction of the existent." Very similar language is used by Vâchaspati Mis'ra, too, in his *Sânkhyatattvakaumudî* 9 and 15. See also, *Kshurikâ-Upanishad* 3, and *Gîtâ* ii. 58.

कृत्वाचिन्तान्यायः ॥

The nyâya stands thus in *Tantravârtika* 3. 4. 1 :—"यस्तु भाष्यकारेणोपन्यासः कृतः स कृत्वाचिन्तान्यायेनेति द्रष्टव्यम्." On applying to my friend Mr. Arthur Venis for an elucidation of the nyâya he replied as follows:—"I have always understood it as the method of granting to your adversary what later you mean to refute, for which another common expression is अभ्युपगमवाद. The word कृत्वा is elliptical for इति कृत्वा, that is, having admitted your adversary's point, you proceed to the चिन्ता or discussion of it." This view seems to be confirmed by the fact that in *S'âstradîpikâ*, pages 615, 666, 707, 710, and 739, it takes the form of "इति कृत्वा चिन्त्यते," and that in S'abara on Jaimini 11. 3. 16. and 12, 2. 11, we read at the close of each "इत्येवं कृत्वा चिन्त्यते । कृत्वाचिन्तेयम्."

In his *Saḍdars'anacintanikâ*, Mr. M. M. Kunte gives three different renderings of the expression. On page 650 (where it is attached to the title of the *adhikaraṇa*) its meaning is said to be "a point already discussed," and he claims for it the authority of Mâdhava; then, on page 1999, it

is rendered "an adjustment not founded on fact;" and, finally, on page 2040, "the examination of a subject after merely granting an opponent's statement." This third rendering coincides with that of Mr. Venis.

I may add that Prof. Gangânâtha Jhâ tells me that a paṇḍit would explain the term thus:—"कृत्वा (यद्यप्येतद्विषयकसंशयो नोदेति तथापि तद्विषयगतसकलविचारस्योपन्यासार्थं कल्पनां कृत्वा) चिन्ता (विचारः)." Or, as the Professor himself puts it, "the bhâsya has introduced certain points of discussion simply for *the sake of argument*, in order to exhaust all possible alternatives with regard to the subject matter of the adhikaraṇa." I have not met with the nyâya anywhere but in works on Mîmâṃsâ.

क्षीरं विहायारोचकग्रस्तस्य सौवीररुचिमनुभवति ॥

"Leaving the milk suitable to the dyspeptic, he enjoys the sour gruel." The nyâya is found in this form in the Akshapâda section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (P. 118 of *Bib. Ind.* edition and p. 134 of Jîvânanda's ed.) as follows:—"ननु सुखाभिव्यक्तिर्मुक्तिरिति पक्षं परित्यज्य दुःखनिवृत्तिरेव मुक्तिरिति स्वीकारः क्षीरं विहायारोचकग्रस्तस्य सौवीररुचिमनुभवतीति चेत्तदेतन्नाटकपक्षपतितं त्वद्वच इत्युपेक्ष्यते" ॥

Prof. Cowell translates it thus:—"But if you give up the view that liberation is the manifestation of happiness, and then accept such a view as that which holds it to be only the cessation of pain, does not your conduct resemble that of the dyspeptic patient who refused sweet milk and preferred sour rice-gruel? Your satire, however, falls powerless, as fitter for some speech in a play [rather than for a grave philosophical argument]." There can be little doubt however that Mâdhava took the nyâya from Udayana's *Âtmatattvaviveka* where it appears (on page 56, line 5,) as "क्षीरं विहाय रुचिररोचकग्रस्तस्य सौवीरे." I know of no other instance of it, and it is not in Raghunâtha's *Laukikanyâyasangraha.*

खल्वाटबिल्वीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the bald* (or *bare-headed*) *man, and the woodapple.* Vardhamâna (iii. 195) explains it thus:—"यथा खल्वाटः पर्यटन्नतर्कितं श्रीफलतरोरधस्तादागतो दैववशाच्च बिल्वमुपरि पतितं तद्वदन्योऽप्युभयवस्तुसंयोग एवमुच्यते" ॥ Bhartrihari, in his *Nîti-s'ataka* 90, brings the bald man under a *palm* tree:—

"खल्वाटो दिवसेश्वरस्य किरणैः संतापितो मस्तके
वाञ्छन्देशमनातपं विधिवशात्तालस्य मूलं गतः।
तत्राप्यस्य महाफलेन पतता भग्नं सशब्दं शिरः
प्रायो गच्छति यत्र भाग्यरहितस्तत्रैव यान्त्यापदः" ॥

This maxim belongs to the same class as अजाकृपाणीय and काकतालीय, which see.

गगनरोमन्थन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *ruminating on ether.* Equivalent to beating the air. It is found twice in the *Sarvadars'anasangraha.* First, in the Râmânuja section (page 57 of Jîvânanda's edition, and 47 of Bib. Ind.):—"तदेतद्गगनरोमन्थायितम्", which Prof. Gough renders "All this is about as profitable as it would be for a ruminant animal to ruminate on ether." Secondly, in the Pâṇini section (pages 162 and 143 respectively):—"तदेतद्गगनरोमन्थकल्पम्", rendered by Prof. Cowell by "All this is only the ruminating of empty ether." In the *Nyâyamanjarî* page 453, it appears in a slightly different form, in the expression "व्योम्नि रोमन्थकेलिवत्;" and in *S'âlikâ* p. 154, and *Nyâyamakaranda,* page 129, we meet with गगनग्रासकल्प.

गड्डरिकाप्रवाहन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a continuous rush of sheep.* It is used to indicate the blind following of others like a flock of sheep. So the *Vâchaspatyam,* which says:—"गड्डलिकानामवीनां संघादेका

चेन्नद्यादौ पतति तदा तत्संघान्तर्गताः सर्वेऽपि वार्यमाणा अपि तत्र पतन्तीति लोकप्रसिद्ध्या यत्र वार्यमाणानामपि अनिष्टमार्गे धावनं तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ The expression occurs in Chap. viii. (page 214) of the *Kâvyaprakâs'a* where a very helpful note of Mahes'achandra's will be found; and also in Chap. vi, page 188, of the *Sâhityadarpaṇa*, which however, Mr. Pramadâdâsa Mitra has rendered, "in pursuance of established custom."

It is found, also, on pages 86 and 125 of Abhinavagupta's commentary on the *Dhvanyâloka*, and in the opening part of *Kâvyapradîpa* viii (p. 327). There seems to be much difference of opinion as to the correct form of the first word of the maxim, since it appears in the four varieties of गड्डरिका, गड्डलिका, गड्डारिका and गड्डालिका.

गुडजिह्विकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the tongue* [smeared] *with treacle* [in order to disguise an unpalatable draught]. The *Vâchaspatyam* thus explains its use:—"यथा तिक्तताभिया निम्बपानमकुर्वाणस्य बालस्य जिह्वायां गुडलेपं दत्वा पित्रादिस्तं निम्बं पाययति एवमर्थवादवाक्यानि बह्वायाससाध्ये कर्मण्यप्रवर्त्तमानं पुरुषं स्वर्गाक्षय्यादिकं श्रावयित्वा प्रवर्त्तयन्ति । फलश्रुतिरपि रोचनार्था"॥

An excellent example of this is found in *Kâvyapradîpa*, p. 7:—"ये सुकुमारमतयोऽतिसुखिस्वभावा राजकुमारादयो नीरसे नीतिशास्त्रे प्रवर्तयितुमशक्यास्तान्काव्यं कान्तेव सरसतापादनेनाभिमुखीकृत्योपदेशं ग्राहयति गुडजिह्विकया शिशूनिवौषधम् । यथाहुः ।

स्वादुकाव्यरसोन्मिश्रं वाक्यार्थमुपभुञ्जते ।
प्रथमालीढमधवः पिबन्ति कटु भेषजम्" ॥

It is employed in a similar manner by Abhinavagupta in his comment on *Dhvanyâloka* iii. 30, and by the author of *Padamanjarî* in the early part of his work (the Pandit x. 254); and, somewhat less clearly, in *Bhâmatî*, pages 342, 534, and *Nyâyavârtikatâtparyaṭîkâ*, pages 438, 441.

गोबलीवर्दन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the cattle and the bull.* In the *Paṇḍit* for October 1867, Râjârâma S'âstrî expounded it thus:—"यत्र गाः कालय बलीवर्दं चेत्युच्यते तत्र गोपदेनैव बलीवर्दपदसिद्धौ बलीवर्दपदं दुर्दम्यत्वज्ञापनपरत्वेन सफलमिति कल्प्यते" ॥ That given in the *Vâchaspatyam* is somewhat fuller:—"बलीवर्दस्य गोविशेषत्वेऽपि बलीवर्दस्य झटिति गोत्वेन बोधनार्थं यथा प्रयोगस्तथान्ययोः सामान्यविशेषरूपयोर्झटिति बोधनार्थं यत्र प्रयोगस्तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ In his exposition of *Manu* viii. 28, where six classes of women are enumerated as having a claim to the king's protection, Kullûka says:—"अत्र चानेकशब्दोपादाने गोबलीवर्दन्यायेन पुनरुक्तिपरीहारः" ॥ The commentators Râghavânanda and Govindarâja also quote the maxim in the same connection, and we have it in *Kâvyapradîpa* vii. 11 (page 300). Vâcaspatimis'ra, too, makes frequent use of it. It occurs in *Bhâmatî*, pages 518, 536; and in *Nyâyavârtikatâtparyaṭîkâ*, pages 11, 118, 119 and 404. It belongs to the same class as ब्राह्मणवसिष्ठन्याय and ब्राह्मणपरिव्राजकन्याय.

गोमयपायसीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *cowdung as a milky preparation.* Some stupid person is supposed to argue that cowdung is made of milk, because it comes from the cow; hence it is used to denote an utterly absurd argument or statement. It occurs in Vyâsa's bhâshya on *Yogasûtra* i. 32. He says:—"कथंचित्समाधीयमानमप्येतद्गोमयपायसीयन्यायमाक्षिपति" ॥ On which the *Yogavârtika* remarks:—"गोमयं पायसं गव्यत्वादित्यादिन्यायमतद्दूषणं समाधीयमानमप्याक्षिपति तिरस्करोति" ॥ See, too, *Nyâyavârtikatâtparyaṭîkâ*, p. 435.

It is found also in the Bauddha section of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 18 of Bib. Ind. and 22 of Jîvânanda's edition) in the following sentence:—"एवं चायमभेदसाधको हेतुर्गोमयपायसीयन्यायवदाभासतां भजेत्", which Professor Gough renders "Thus this argument which you adduce to prove that there is

difference between subject and object, turns out a mere absurdity, *like milky food made of cowdung.*"

The compound गोमयपायसीय is included in *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 196, but Vardhamâna did not explain it.

घट्टकुटीप्रभातन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *day-break in the vicinity of the toll-collector's hut.* A man, anxious to avoid paying toll, takes another road, but losing his way in the dark, finds himself, at day-break, in the vicinity of that very toll-gate! The saying is employed to illustrate उद्देश्यासिद्धि, as Prof. Cowell puts it; that is, failure to accomplish a desired object. It occurs in the Pâṇini section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* as follows:—"ननु स्फोटवाचकतापक्षेऽपि प्रागुक्तविकल्पप्रसरेण घट्टकुटीप्रभातायितमिति चेत्तदेतन्मनोराज्यविजृम्भणं वैषम्यसंभवात्", which is thus rendered by Prof. Cowell:—"But even on your own hypothesis that there is a certain thing called *sphoṭa* which expresses the meaning, the same untenable alternative will recur which we discussed before; and therefore it will only be a case of the proverb that '*the dawn finds the smuggler with the revenue-officer's house close by*'. This, however, is only the inflation of the world of fancy from the wide difference between the two cases."

S'rîharsha, too, used the simile in his *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya* (page 35):—"तर्हि कारणस्य सत्तामभ्युपगतवानसीति घट्टकुट्यां प्रभातमिति चेन्न" ॥ See also *Siddhântales'a*, pages 40 and 116; *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, page 62; *Advaitabrahmasiddhi*, pages 63, 146, 219, 371; *Citsukhî*, i. 12; ii. 24 (Paṇḍit iv. 518; v. 510), and *Kusumânjali* iii. 19 (page 496).

घुणाक्षरन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the letter made by the wood-worm ghuṇa.* This worm bores holes in wood and in books which sometimes assume the shape of a letter of the alphabet; hence its use to

intimate the occurrence of something quite accidental. Here is Vardhamâna's (iii. 195) description of it :—घुणोत्किरणात्कथंचिन्निष्पन्नमक्षरं घुणाक्षरम् । तदिव यदकुशलेन दैवान्निष्पद्यते तद्घुणाक्षरीयम्" ॥

The simile is found in the opening part of *Prasanna-râghava* (page 9) as follows:—" अहो घुणाक्षरन्यायो यदिदं भ्रमरद्वयं प्रति मयोक्तं बन्दिद्वयं प्रति फलितं वचः" ॥ Also in *Râjatarañgiṇî* iv. 167 :—" त्रीन्वारान्समरे जित्वा जितं मेने स मुम्मुनिम् । सकृज्जयमरेर्वीरा मन्यन्ते हि घुणाक्षरम्" ॥ *Mâgha* iii. 58 may also be referred to.

चन्द्रचन्द्रिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the moon and its light.* Used of two inseparable things. It is found in Ânandagiri's *S'ankaravijaya,* page 124 :— " अतः सर्वदेवकारणस्य रुद्रस्य या शक्तिश्चन्द्रचन्द्रिकान्यायेन तदुद्बोधरूपिणी स्वाधीनवल्लभेति प्रसिद्धा सैव भवानी" ॥

चौरापराधान्माण्डव्यनिग्रहन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the punishment of Mâṇḍavya for the crime committed by robbers.* The story of the Rishi Aṇî-Mâṇḍavya is told at length in *Âdiparva* cvii, cviii. Whilst he was practising severe austerities, in conjunction with the *mauna-vrata,* some robbers concealed themselves and their plunder in his Âs'rama. The king's guard found them there, and, believing the sage to be implicated in the affair, carried him off together with them and impaled them all together! Mâṇḍavya was eventually removed from the stake, but its point (अणी) remained in him; hence the name, given him by the people, of Aṇî-Mâṇḍavya. The maxim is found in the Pûrṇaprajna chapter of *Sarva-dars'anasangraha* (page 73 of Jîvânanda's edition, and 62 of Bib. Ind.):—" तस्मान्न भेदप्रत्यक्षं सुप्रसरमिति चेत्किं वस्तुस्वरूपभेदवादिनं प्रति इमानि दूषणान्युद्घुष्यन्ते किंवा धर्मिभेदवादिनं प्रति । प्रथमे चौरापराधान्माण्डव्यनिग्रहन्यायापातः" ॥ But its earliest occurrence is in *Âtma-tattvaviveka,* page 70, line 15, where we read "एवं हि चौरापराधेन

ऽयत्क्रमयं माण्डव्यनिग्रहः स्यात् " ॥ and it was from this source that the Khaṇḍanakâra, too, derived the ṇyâya together with several pages of context! Compare pages 633–636 of S'rîharṣa's work with pages 70 and 71 of Udayana's.

छत्रिन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the men with umbrellas.* The thought here is of a crowd of men, *many* of them with umbrellas up, and so *all* seeming to have them. Its application will be apparent from the examples which follow. We have one in S'ankara's bhâshya on *Kaṭha-Upanishad* iii. 1 ("ऋतं पिबन्तौ" &c.):—"एकस्तत्र कर्मफलं पिबति भुङ्क्ते नेतरस्तथापि पातृसंबन्धात्पिबन्तावित्युच्यते छत्त्रिन्यायेन" ॥ Again, in his bhâshya on *Vedântasûtra* 3. 3. 34, where the same text is expounded:—"ऋतं पिबन्तावित्यत्र तु जीवे पिबत्यशनायाद्यतीतः परमात्मापि साहचर्याच्छत्त्रिन्यायेन पिबतीत्युपचर्यते" ॥ On the former of these two passages, the commentator Gopâla Yatîndra says:—"छत्त्रिन्यायेनेति । यथा लोके छत्त्रिणो गच्छन्तीति प्रयोगे सपरिवारे राज्ञि गच्छति छत्र्यछत्त्रिसमुदाये छत्त्रिशब्दो वर्त्तत एकसमूहवाहित्वेनैवं पिबदपिबत्समुदाये पिबतिर्वर्त्तत इत्यर्थः ॥

I have met with the maxim in the *Kuvalayânanda* also under the figure उल्लास, and in Ânandagiri on *Brahmasûtra-bhâshya* 1. 2. 11; 1. 4. 12.

But the nyâya is found long before S'ankara's time, and perhaps originated with S'abara, in whose bhâshya on Jaimini 1. 4. 28 we read "यथा छत्त्रिणो गच्छन्तीत्येकेन छत्त्रिणा सर्वे लक्ष्यन्ते"; and in *Tantravârtika* 1. 4. 13 " तस्मादेकदेशस्थैरपि विश्वेदेवैरुपलक्षितानां छत्त्रिन्यायेन तत्प्रख्यतयैव सर्वेषां नामधेयत्वम् " ॥

तमोदीपन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *darkness and the lamp.* This is found in the *Vedântasiddhântamuktâvali* (page 125) where we read:—

" तदयं तमोदीपन्यायः । तथाहि । अज्ञानं ज्ञातुमिच्छेद्यो मानेनात्यन्तमूढधीः । स तु नूनं तमः पश्येद्दीपेनोत्तमतेजसा" ॥ " Hence the well-known illustration of darkness and the lamp:—Thus that dullest of dull-heads who would cognize Nescience by means of a pramâṇa, would forsooth go looking for darkness with a brilliant lamp."

This verse is most probably based on that of Sures'vara in *Taittirîyavârtika* 2. 1. 177 :—

" प्रमाणोत्पन्नया दृष्ट्या योऽविद्यां द्रष्टुमिच्छति ।
दीपेनासौ ध्रुवं पश्येद्गुहाकुक्षिगतं तमः" ॥

दग्धपटन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the burnt cloth.* When a piece of cloth, or a leaf, is thrown into the fire and consumed, its outline is still visible in the charred remains; and this the Vedântists use to illustrate the unreality and unsubstantiality of all phenomena. It occurs twice in Nṛisiṁhasarasvatî's commentary on the *Vedântasâra*, namely on pages 55 and 66, as follows:—"यद्वा सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्मैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वमित्यादिश्रुतिबलात्सर्वमहमिति गिरिनदीसमुद्रात्मकं सर्वं जगत्स्वाभिन्नसच्चिदानन्दब्रह्मत्वेनानुभूय तस्य दग्धपटन्यायेन प्रपञ्चभानेऽप्यद्वैतं सच्चिदानन्दलक्षणं वस्तु भासत एवेत्यर्थः" ॥ (Page 55).

"नन्वेतादृशस्य जीवन्मुक्तस्य देहेन्द्रियादिभानमस्ति न वेत्याशङ्क्य दग्धपटन्यायेनेन्द्रजालनिर्मितसौधसमुद्रादिवच्च बाधितानुवृत्त्या मिथ्यात्वेन भानेऽपि परमार्थतया भानं नेत्याह अयमित्यादिना न पश्यतीत्यन्तेन" ॥ (Page 66).

दण्डापूपिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the stick and the cakes.* If a number of cakes (chapâṭis) are attached to a stick, and the stick is carried off or eaten by mice, the inference is that the cakes have shared the same fate. The application of the maxim is obvious. In the *Sâhityakaumudî* (xi. 8), and in the *Kuvalayânanda* (page 244), it is used to illustrate the figure अर्थापत्ति and काव्यार्थापत्ति respectively.

"दण्डापूपिकयान्यार्थागमोऽर्थापत्तिरिष्यते ॥ ८ ॥ मूषिकेण दण्डो भक्षितश्चेदिहस्थः पूपोऽपि तेन भक्षित इति न्यायो दण्डापूपिका । तयान्यार्थागमोऽर्थान्तरप्रत्ययोऽर्थापत्तिरित्यर्थः" ॥ (*Sâh.*)

"कैमुत्येनार्थसंसिद्धिः काव्यार्थापत्तिरिष्यते* । स जितस्त्वन्मुखेनेन्दुः का वार्त्ता सरसीरुहाम् ॥ अत्र स इत्यनेन पद्मानि येन जितानीति विवक्षितं तथा च सोऽपि येन जितस्तेन पद्मानि जितानीति किमु वक्तव्यमिति दण्डापूपिकान्यायेन पद्मजयरूपस्यार्थस्य संसिद्धिः काव्यार्थापत्तिः । तान्त्रिकाभिमतार्थापत्तिव्यावर्त्तनाय काव्येति विशेषणम्" ॥ (*Kuv.*).

See also *Bṛihadâraṇyakopanishad-bhâshyavârtika*, page 909, verse 135.

देहलीदीपन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a lamp on the threshold.* A lamp so placed gives light both inside and outside the house, and is therefore used as an illustration of anything which fulfills a double purpose. S'abara refers to such a lamp in his bhâshya on *Jaimini* 12. 1. 3 :—" यथा प्रासादे कृतः प्रदीपः सन्निधानाद्राजमार्गेऽप्युपकरोति". There is a similar expression, too, in *Kuvalayânanda*, page 97. Another good example of the nyâya is found in the commentary on *Saptapadârthî*, page 52. The text stands thus:—" द्रव्यानारंभकं कार्यद्रव्यमन्त्यावयवि ॥ प्रागभाववत्कार्यम् ॥ भोगायतनमन्त्यावयवि शरीरम्" ॥ on which Mâdhava Sarasvatî remarks:— "शरीरलक्षणेऽन्त्यावयविपदज्ञानाय तल्लक्षणमाह द्रव्येति । यद्यप्युद्देशानन्तरं लक्षणस्य वक्तव्यत्वाच्छरीरलक्षणानन्तरं भोगादिवदन्त्यावयवी लक्षयितुमुचितस्तथाप्यत्र द्रव्यपदव्यवच्छेद्यत्वेन प्राप्तत्वाद्देहलीप्रदीपन्यायेनोभयत्रोपकार्यतयात्रैव लक्षित इत्यदोषः" ॥

My friend Professor Cowell pointed out another instance of the use of the nyâya in Ânandagiri's *S'ankaravijaya* xi, page 82. The maxim is akin to काकाक्षिगोलकन्याय and जामात्रर्थं श्रपितस्य सूपादेरतिथ्युपकारकत्वम् ॥

---

* The author of *Rasagangâdhara* finds fault with this definition. See page 487 of Durgâprasâda's edition, Bombay 1888.

नष्टाश्वदग्धरथन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the lost horses and burnt chariot.* This is based on the story of two men travelling in their respective chariots, and one of them losing his horses and the other having his chariot burnt, through the outbreak of a fire in the village in which they were putting up for the night. The horses that were left were harnessed to the remaining chariot, and the two men pursued their journey together. Its teaching is—union for mutual advantage. That the story is very old is clear from the fact that the saying is quoted in the 16th *vârtika* ("संप्रयोगो वा नष्टाश्वदग्धरथवत्") to *Pâṇini* 1. 1. 50, and again in S'abara's *bhâshya* 2. 1. 1. It appears also in Sures'vara's *Bṛihadâraṇya-bhâshyavârtika* 2. 1. 38, which reads thus:—"नष्टाश्वदग्धरथवन्न्यायं चाश्रित्य भूमिपम् । प्राह मानुषवित्ताढ्यं दैववित्तसमन्वितः" ॥ On which Ânandagiri says:—"अधिकारिणे विद्यां वक्तुं गार्ग्यश्चेदुपचक्रमे तर्हि योग्यं ब्राह्मणं हित्वा किमिति राजानमुपेत्य ब्रवीति । तत्राह नष्टेति । यथाहुर्युक्तः संयोगोऽधिकारार्थेन हेतुना नष्टाश्वदग्धरथवदिति" ॥

Râmtîrtha, too, quotes the maxim in his comment on the *Vedântasâra* (page 93, line 3):—"नष्टाश्वदग्धरथन्यायेन 'कर्मणा पितृलोक' इति श्रुतिरुपपद्यते", of which the following translation is found in *The Pandit* for May 1872:—"The Vedic text 'The world of progenitors is attained by works,' can be explained according to the analogy of two men, of whom the horses of the one are lost and the chariot of the other burnt [for the horses of the latter may be yoked to the car of the former, and they may travel together; and in like manner, constant and occasional works, though no special result has been recorded of them, may supply a cause for the attainment of the world of the progenitors, which requires some special works as a condition]." See also *Tantravârtika*, pp. 15, 709, 832, and *Bhâmatî*, page 81.

नहि कठोरकण्ठीरवस्य कुरङ्गशावः प्रतिभटो भवति ॥

A young fawn cannot stand up against a full-grown lion.

s found in the Akshapâda chapter of *Sarvadars'ana-sangraha* (page 136 of Jîvânanda's, and 119 of Bib. Ind.):— "नैतत्परीक्षाक्षममीक्ष्यते नहि कठोरकण्ठीरवस्य कुरङ्गशावः प्रतिभटो भवति", which Prof. Cowell renders, "This pretented inference will no more stand examination than the young fawn can stand the attack of the full-grown lion." Compare "नाल्पीयसा महतोऽभिभवः संभवति" ॥ of *S'âlikâ*, page 94, and see the nyâya "नहि भवति तरक्षुः &c." in *Second Handful.*

नहि खदिरगोचरे परशौ पलाशे द्वैधीभावो भवति ॥

The Palâs'a tree is not cleft when the axe is applied to the Khadira tree. The saying is used to indicate that two objects are essentially distinct. I have met with it in three of Vâcas-patimis'ra's works.

It occurs in *Bhâmatî* 2. 2. 28 (page 438) in the following connection. "स्वरूपं विज्ञानस्यासत्याकारयुक्तं प्रमेयम् । प्रमेयप्रकाशनं प्रमाण-फलं, तत्प्रकाशनशक्तिः प्रमाणम् । बाह्यवादिनोरपि वैभाषिकसौत्रान्तिकयोः काल्पनिक एव प्रमाणफलव्यवहारोऽभिमत इत्याह 'सत्यपि बाह्येऽर्थे' इति । भिन्नाधिकरणत्वे हि प्रमाणफलयोस्तद्भावो न स्यात् । नहि खदिरगोचरे परशौ पलाशे द्वैधीभावो भवति । तस्मादनयोरैकाधिकरण्यं वक्तव्यम्" ॥

Then in *Yogabhâṣyaṭîkâ* i. 7 we read :—ननु पुरुषवर्ती बोधः कथं चित्तगताया वृत्तेः फलम् । नहि खदिरगोचरव्यापारेण परशुना पलाशे छिदा क्रियत इति" ॥

And very similarly in *Nyâyavârtikatâtparyaṭîkâ*, page 67:— "अथ प्रमाणफलयोर्भिन्नविषयत्वेन विप्रतिपत्त्या प्रमाणफलभावायोगात् । नहि पनसविषयेण परशुना खदिरे द्वैधीभावो भवति" ॥ But he is not the only writer who makes use of it, for in *Advaitabrahmasiddhi*, page 93, we read:—"तयोर्भिन्नाधिकरणवृत्तित्वे खदिरगोचरे परशौ पालाशे द्वैधीभावो भवेत्" ॥ For earlier references to this nyâya, see the Superaddenda to the *Third Handful.*

न हि वरविघाताय कन्योद्वाहः ॥

The bride is not married for the destruction of the bride-groom. This is found in *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 4. 1. 2, and in the Pûrṇaprajna chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 63 of Bib. Ind., and 75 of Jîvânanda's edn.). It occurs also in *Jîvanmuktiviveka*, page 101 (line 4 from bottom). In the *Vâchaspatyam* and in the *Laukikanyâyasangraha*, the maxim is given in the *positive* form, *viz.* "वरघाताय कन्यावरणम्" with the other as a possible variant. Târânâtha explains it thus:—"विषकन्यायां वृतायां यत्र वरस्य घातः संभाव्यते तत्र तां नोद्वहेदेवं विवक्षायामस्य प्रवृत्तिः । तथा चानिष्टान्तरपातादिसंभावनायामभीष्टहेतुरपि वस्तु न वरणीयमित्येवं तन्न्यायतात्पर्यम् । अयमेव न्यायः क्वचिन्न हि वरघाताय कन्यामुद्वाहयतीति न्यायतया पठ्यते" ॥ We have a reference to "poison-damsels" in *Kathâsaritsâgara* xix. 82, which reads thus:—"विदधे विषकन्याश्च सैन्ये पण्यविलासिनीः । प्राहिणोत्पुरुषांश्चैव निशासु च्छद्मघातिनः" ॥ In a foot-note to his translation of the passage, Mr. Tawney says, "One of these poison-damsels is represented as having been employed against Chandragupta in the Mudrâ-Râkshasa. Compare the xith tale in the Gesta Romanorum, where an Indian queen sends one to Alexander the Great. Aristotle frustrates the stratagem."

पङ्कप्रक्षालनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the washing off of mud.* It is evidently deduced from *Pañchatantra* ii. 157, a verse intended to strengthen an argument against the possession of riches under any circumstances, and which reads thus:—"धर्मार्थं यस्य वित्तेहा तस्यापि न शुभावहा । प्रक्षालनाद्धि पङ्कस्य दूरादस्पर्शनं वरम्" ॥ "If a man desires wealth for charitable purposes, even to him it will bring no good; for, better than the washing off of mud is the keeping away from it altogether." The nyâya is therefore the equivalent of our "Prevention is better than cure." In his bhâshya on *Brahmasûtra* 3. 2. 22. S'ankara twice quotes the second line of the above couplet; and, in commenting thereon, Ânandagiri uses the maxim three times. It is again applied twice by him

5

on *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 4. 1. 16. as follows:—"अग्निहोत्रादीनामपि पुण्यान्तरवद्विनाश्यत्वात्पङ्कक्षालनन्यायापातादारुरुक्षुणापि तानि नानुष्ठेयानि"; "धीनाश्यानामपि कर्मणामनुष्ठानस्य विद्योत्पत्त्यर्थतया पङ्कप्रक्षालनन्यायानवकाशात्पूर्वं ज्ञानादनुष्ठेयान्यग्निहोत्रादीनीति सिद्धान्तप्रतिज्ञां विवृणोति." See also *Bhâmatî* and *Bhâshyaratnaprabhâ* on the same, and *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, page 97, line 14.

पङ्ग्वन्धन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the lame man and the blind man.* The conception is that of a lame man mounted on the shoulders of one who is blind, so that the former is furnished with the power of locomotion and the latter with sight. It is intended to illustrate mutual dependence for mutual advantage, as exemplified in *Sânkhyakârikâ* 21, the text of which, with Colebrooke's translation, is as follows:—"पुरुषस्य दर्शनार्थं कैवल्यार्थं तथा प्रधानस्य। पङ्ग्वन्धवदुभयोरपि संयोगस्तत्कृतः सर्गः" ॥ "For the soul's contemplation of Nature, and for its abstraction, the union of both takes place, as of the halt and blind. By that union a creation is framed." Vâchaspati Mis'ra ignores the illustration, but Paṇḍit Târânâtha has a helpful note on it. He says:—"उक्तार्थे दृष्टान्तः पङ्ग्वन्धवदिति। यथा गतिशक्तिरहितस्य पङ्गोर्गतिसाधनाय गतिमतोऽन्धस्यापेक्षा, दृष्टिशक्तिरहितस्य चान्धस्य गतिशक्तिसत्त्वेऽपि स्वाभीष्टदेशगमनं दर्शकमन्तरेण न संभवति तथा च यथा स्वस्वकार्याय तयोरन्योन्यापेक्षा तथा क्रियारहितस्य पुरुषस्य सक्रियप्रधानस्यापेक्षा दृष्टिशक्तिरहितस्य च प्रधानस्य दृष्टिशक्तियुक्तपुरुषस्यापेक्षेत्यत उभाभ्यामन्योन्यमपेक्ष्य स्वस्वकार्यं निष्पाद्यत इत्यर्थः" ॥ The above *kârikâ* is quoted on the last page of the Sânkhya section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha*, and is preceded by a very clear explanation of the maxim.

पञ्जरचालनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the moving of the bird-cage.* An illustration of the power of united effort. In a discussion on *prâṇa*, under *Vedântasûtra* 2. 4. 9, S'ankara introduces this maxim and

explains it thus:—"ननु पञ्जरचालनन्यायेनैतद्भविष्यति । यथैकपञ्जरवर्तिन एकादशपक्षिणः प्रत्येकं प्रतिनियतव्यापाराः सन्तः संभूयैकं पञ्जरं चालयन्ति । एवमेकशरीरवर्तिन एकादशप्राणाः प्रत्येकं प्रतिनियतवृत्तयः सन्तः संभूयैकां प्राणाख्यां वृत्तिं प्रतिलप्स्यन्त इति" ॥ Dr. Thibaut translates the passage as follows:—"But, an objection may be raised, the thing may take place in the manner of the moving [of the?] bird-cage. Just as eleven birds shut up in one cage, may, although each makes a separate effort, move the cage by the combination of their efforts, so the eleven prâṇas which abide in one body may, although each has its own special function, by the combination of these functions, produce one common function called prâṇa."

पाटच्चरलुण्ठिते वेश्मनि यामिकजागरणम् ॥

The vigilance of the watchman after the house has been plundered by thieves. Equivalent to our proverb "Shutting the stable door after the horse is gone." It occurs in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya*, page 45:—"प्रयोजनानुपयुक्ते काले तस्य स्वरूपतोऽवस्थानं पाटच्चरलुण्ठिते वेश्मनि यामिकजागरणवृत्तान्तमनुहरति" ॥

पिण्याकयाचनार्थं गतस्य खारिकातैलदातृत्वाभ्युपगमः ॥

He went to crave the leavings of the oil-seed, and had instead to agree to give 16 *measures of oil.* Used of one completely worsted in argument. I render पिण्याक in accordance with its meaning in *Pañchatantra* iii. 99 ("श्रेयस्तैलं च पिण्याकात्"). The maxim is found in the Pûrṇaprajna section of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 63 of Bib. Ind., and 75 of Jîvânanda):—"सोऽयं पिण्याकयाचनार्थं गतस्य खारिकातैलदातृत्वाभ्युपगम इव", which Prof. Gough renders:—"And thus it must be allowed that, in raising the objection, you have begged for a little oil-cake, and have had to give us gallons of oil."

पिष्टपेषणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the grinding of that which is already ground.* Fruitless reiteration, unproductive repetition. The oldest in-

stance, known to me, of the employment of the nyâya, is by S'abara on Jaimini 9. 2. 3:—"न हि स्निग्धस्य स्नेहनं शक्यं कर्तुं पिष्टस्य वा पेषणम्". It occurs again in 12. 2. 16, and in *Tantravârtika*, pp. 54 and 477. We find it likewise in S'ankara's bhâshya on *Kena-Upanishad* 32:—"यदि तावच्छ्रुतस्यार्थस्य प्रश्नः कृतस्ततः पिष्टपेषणवत्पुनरुक्तोऽनर्थकः प्रश्नः स्यात्" ॥, and in Sudars'anârya's comment on *Âpastamba-Grihyasûtra* xiv. 9 ("पुंसवनं व्यक्ते गर्भे तिष्येण"), where he says "इदमपि सीमन्तवत्प्रथम एव न तु प्रतिगर्भं पिष्टपेषणन्यायात्" ॥ Compare तुषकण्डनन्याय in *Second Handful.*

प्रदीपे प्रदीपं प्रज्वाल्य तमोनाशाय यतमानः ॥

Trying to remove the dimness of a lamp by lighting another. Used of foolishly superfluous and misdirected effort. It occurs in *Khandanakhandakhâdya*, page 294:—"लघोरुपायात्साध्यसिद्धौ भवन्त्यां...गुरावुपाये प्रवर्तमानस्य तवैवेदं दोषोद्भावनं प्रदीपे प्रदीपं प्रज्वाल्य तमोनाशाय यतमानस्येव पुंसः" ॥ In a footnote, the editor says:—"प्रदीपं प्रज्वाल्य प्रदीपे तमोनाशाय यतमानस्य पुंस इवेत्यन्वयः."

In *Upades'asâhasrî* xvii. 41 (page 215), we read:—"न हि दीपान्तरापेक्षा यद्वद्दीपप्रकाशने । बोधस्यात्मस्वरूपत्वान्न बोधान्यस्तथेष्यते"; and, in Sures'vara's *Brihadâranyakavârtika* 4. 3. 501:—"ननु दीपः स्वमात्मानं स्वात्मनैवावभासयन् । दृष्टो दीपप्रकाशार्थं न हि दीपान्तराहृतिः" ॥ See also *Nyâyamanjarî*, page 625, on *Nyâyasûtra* 5. 1. 10.

प्रधानमल्लनिबर्हणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the destruction of the chief antagonist.* The principle that when the most formidable enemy has been defeated, the less formidable are already virtully overcome. In the bhâshya on *Vedântasûtra* 1. 4. 28 ("एतेन सर्वे व्याख्याता व्याख्याताः") we read:—"अतः प्रधानमल्लनिबर्हणन्यायेनातिदिशति । एतेन प्रधानकारणवादप्रतिषेधन्यायकलापेन सर्वेऽण्वादिकारणवादा अपि प्रतिषिद्धतया व्याख्याता वेदितव्याः" ॥ Here, there is undoubtedly a play on the word प्रधान, the Sânkhya theory of the Pradhâna being the chief antagonist met and overcome in the foregoing Sûtras

and bhâshya. The same expression appears again in the bhâshya on *Sûtra* 2. 1. 12, and the maxim is found, too, in the Râmânuja chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 54 of Jîvânanda's edition, and p. 45 of Bib. Ind. edition).

बीजाङ्कुरन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *an eternal series of seed and shoot.* As the seed produces the shoot, so the latter in turn reproduces the former. Each therefore is a cause and an effect. The maxim is met with very frequently in the literature. We find it in *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 2. 1. 36 (on the eternity of the world) as follows:—"न च कर्मान्तरेण शरीरं संभवति । न च शरीरमन्तरेण कर्म संभवतीतीतरेतराश्रयत्वप्रसङ्गः । अनादित्वे तु बीजाङ्कुरन्यायेनोपपत्तेर्न कश्चिद्दोषो भवति", which is rendered thus by Dr. Thibaut:—"Without merit and demerit no body can enter into existence, and again, without a body merit and demerit cannot be formed; so that—on the doctrine of the world having a beginning—we are led into a logical see-saw. The opposite doctrine, on the other hand, explains all matters in a manner analogous to the case of the seed and sprout, so that no difficulty remains." It occurs again at the end of the *bhâshya* on 3. 2. 9. Also in the Ârhata section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 31 of Bib. Ind., and 37 of Jîvânanda), in Râmatîrtha's commentary on *Vedântasâra* (page 110), and in *Pancapâdikâ*, page 12, line 12.

ब्राह्मणपरिव्राजकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the Brâhmans and the mendicants.* In such a sentence as ब्राह्मणा भोजयितव्याः परिव्राजकाश्च the separate mention of the latter, who are really included in the former term, merely emphasizes their position as a special part of the general body. It is thus the exact parallel of the गोबलीवर्दन्याय and of the ब्राह्मणवसिष्ठन्याय. It is used by S'ankara three times in his exposition of the *Vedântasûtras*, namely under 1. 4. 16, 2. 3. 15, and 3. 1. 11; but I forbear to quote his words, for without a

lengthy portion of context they would be unintelligible. It appears also in *Tantravârtika*, pages 423, 590.

ब्राह्मणवसिष्ठन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the Brâhmans and Vasishṭha.* This is of the same type as ब्राह्मणपरिव्राजकन्याय, which see. Satyavrata gives as a reference "हलन्त्यं-सूत्रभाष्यं," *i. e.* Patanjali on *Pâṇini* 1. 3. 3. But the reference is a pure delusion; and I think I may safely say that the maxim is not to be found in any part of the *Mahâbhâshya.* It would not be unreasonable, however, to infer that the author of the *Padamanjarî* had this nyâya in view when he penned the following:—वैदिकानां लौकिकत्वेऽपि प्राधान्यख्यापनार्थं पृथग्ग्रहणं यथा ब्राह्मणा आगता वसिष्ठोऽप्यागत इति" ॥ (*The Paṇḍit,* vol. x, page 282). Compare तक्रकौण्डिन्यन्याय in *Second Handful.*

ब्राह्मणश्रमणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the Brâhman-ascetic.* The श्रमण is a Buddhist ascetic, and therefore not a Brâhman,—but the expression ब्राह्मणश्रमण implies that though now a Buddhist he was formerly a Brâhman. The maxim is used by the authors of the *Kâvya-prakâśa* (page 68) and the *Sâhityadarpaṇa* (article 257) in exactly the same connexion. After giving an example of 'suggested meaning' in the form of 'semblance of contradiction' (विरोधाभास), the author of the latter work says:—"अत्रामित इत्यादावपिशब्दाभावाद्विरोधाभासो व्यङ्ग्यः । व्यङ्ग्यस्यालंकार्यत्वेऽपि ब्राह्मणश्रमणन्यायादलंकारत्वमुपचर्यते", which Mr. Pramadâdâsa Mitra renders thus:—"Here, from the absence of the particle अपि after the words अमित &c., the semblance of the ornament-named 'contradiction' is suggested. The suggested meaning, though strictly what is ornamented, is figuratively spoken of here as the ornament, with reference to its being an ornament in another condition [*i. e.* when it is *expressed,* not suggested], just as we use the word Brâhman-mendicant, which, though it

etymologically means an absurdity, *viz.* a mendicant, or one not a Brâhman, who is a Brâhman, tropically signifies one who *was* a Brâhman."

भक्षितेऽपि लशुने न शान्तो व्याधिः ॥

Although the garlic has been eaten the disease is not cured. This proverb is applied as follows by Nṛisimhasarasvatî in his comment on the opening verse of the *Vedântasâra*:—"ननु भक्षितेऽपि लशुने न शान्तो व्याधिरिति न्यायेन प्रपञ्चस्याधिष्ठानव्यतिरिक्ततया प्रतीयमानत्वात्कथमद्वैतसिद्धिरित्याशङ्कां तृणीकुर्वन्नाह अखण्डमिति" ॥ It is found also in *Vedântakalpataruparimala*, page 37.

भिक्षुपादप्रसारणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a beggar's obtaining a firm footing* [in a patron's house]. Perhaps approaching our "Give him an inch and he will take an ell." Târânâtha explains it thus:—"यथा कश्चिद्भिक्षुर्यथेष्टभोजनाच्छादनवासगृहादिलाभार्थं कस्यचिद्धनिनो गृहे प्रविश्य युगपत्सर्वाभीष्टालाभं मन्यमानः प्रथमं धनिगृहे मे पादप्रसारणमस्तु पश्चादनेन परिचयमुत्पाद्य सर्वमभीष्टं संपादयिष्यामीति धिया स्वल्पामपि भिक्षां बहुमन्यमानः पश्चात्क्रमेण स्वाभीष्टं संपादयत्येवं यत्र विवक्षा तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥

It occurs in the Bauddha chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 14 of Bib. Ind. edn.) as follows:—"माध्यमिकास्तावदुत्तमप्रज्ञा इत्थमचीकथन्भिक्षुपादप्रसारणन्यायेन क्षणभङ्गाद्यभिधानमुखेन स्थायित्वानुकूलवेदनीयत्वानुगतसर्वसत्यत्वभ्रमव्यावर्तनेन सर्वशून्यतायामेव पर्यवसानम्" ॥ Here is Prof. Gough's rendering:—"The Mâdhyamikas, excellently wise, explain as follows, namely that the doctrine of Buddha terminates in that of a total void (universal baselessness or nihilism) by a slow progression *like the intrusive steps of a mendicant,* through the position of a momentary flux, and through the (gradual) negation of the illusory assurances of pleasurable sensibility, of universality, and of reality."

I have met with one other example only, namely in Venkaṭanâtha's *Tattvamuktâkalâpa*, page 254:—"अस्त्वेवमिति चेन्न भिक्षु-

पादप्रसारणन्यायेन निरीश्वरवादावतारादतः क्रोधावश्यम्भावादीश्वरस्यापि दुःखावश्यम्भावः" ॥ The subject under discussion here is आगमिकेश्वरसिद्धि. For the cognate expression पादप्रसारिका see the *Second Handful.*

मणिमन्त्रादिन्यायः ॥

The nyâya of *a gem or charm* &c. [as an obstructer or exciter of fire &c., by its presence or absence]. This obscure nyâya is not in Raghunâthavarma's collection, but is defined as follows in the *Vâcaspatyam*, page 4166 :—"मणिमन्त्रादीनां वह्नेर्दाहं प्रति यथा स्वातन्त्र्येण प्रतिबन्धकत्वं लोकसिद्धं न च तत्र युक्त्यपेक्षा एवं कामिनीजिज्ञासाया अपि ज्ञानमात्रं प्रति प्रतिबन्धकत्वमित्येवं यत्र पृथक् प्रतिबन्धकत्वं तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥

I am much indebted to Mr. Arthur Venis for the following note elucidating the nyâya :—"In their analysis of the notion of cause and effect many Indian writers distinguish between those cases in which the processes that intervene (*avântara-vyâpâra*) between the cause and its final product (*kârya*) are known by ordinary experience (*lokasiddha*), and those other cases in which the intermediate stages are not thus known. Of the latter cases, while we know as a fact (say these writers) that, for example, a *maṇi* or a *mantra* will produce a certain effect or prevent it from coming into existence, we are quite unable to explain the rationale of the process in terms of ordinary experience. All that can be said in such cases is that the *maṇi* or the *mantra* has the power (*s'akti*) to produce this or hinder that result. This postulate of a power transcending ordinary experience is the मणिमन्त्रादिन्याय, and its proper application (*pravṛitti*) is to the class of causes thus roughly described. If I remember rightly, another, and to us westerns a more interesting, example of this nyâya is the double fact of *attention to* something and *attention away from* something else. The lover, intent on discovering his mistress (*kâminî-jijnâsâ*), is psychologically dead to all that does not

concern her. But *how* should his attention *to* her cause attention *away from* all the world beside? Here, says the Indian psychologist, analysis of the *how* can proceed no further. The postulate of the मणिमन्त्र must be applied here; or, in other words, we can only say that *attention to* a thing has the power to cause (*s'akti*) *attention away from* something else." This question is discussed in *Kusumânjali* i. 10, and Prof. Cowell's translation of the *kârikâ* and Haridâsa's comment will be found helpful. I have met with the nyâya in the *Sankṣ'epas'ârîraka* iii. 87, 88, 91; in *Tattvamuktâkalâpa* iv. 103, and better still, in v. 99; and in *Vidvanmaṇḍana*, page 59.

मण्डूकप्लुतिन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a frog's leap*. Used by grammarians and others to express the passing from one rule to another over intervening ones. I noted it in the following portions of the *Mahâbhâshya*:—1. 1. 3 (vârt. 2); 5. 2. 4 (2); 6. 1. 17 and 3. 49; and 7. 2. 117. I have met with it also in Jayaratha's commentary on *Alankârasarvasva* 20 ("विषयस्यापह्नवेऽपह्नुतिः"), where he says:—"केचन मण्डूकप्लुतिन्यायेनानुवर्तनस्यानुचितत्वाद्भ्रान्तिमदनन्तरमपह्नुतिर्ग्रन्थकृता लक्षिता उल्लेखश्चातिशयोक्त्यनन्तरमिति ग्रन्थं विपर्यासितवन्तः। न चैतत्" ॥ See, too, *Bhâmatî* 1. 3. 39, and Ballantyne's *Aphorisms of the Nyâya*, ii. 80.

मध्यदीपिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the central lamp*. The idea is of a lamp in a central position shedding its light on all sides. It occurs in the *Muṇḍaka-bhâshya* 1. 1. 3 (शौनको ह वै महाशालोऽङ्गिरसं विधिवदुपसन्नः पप्रच्छ):—"शौनकाङ्गिरसोः संबन्धादर्वाग्विधिवद्विशेषणादुपसदनविधेः पूर्वेषामनियम इति गम्यते। मर्यादाकरणार्थं मध्यदीपिकान्यायार्थं वा विशेषणम्" ॥ Also in Râmatîrtha on *Vedântasâra* (page 129):—"मध्यप्रदीपन्यायेनोत्तरत्रापि जाग्रद्वासनेत्यत्र कोशत्रयपदं संबध्यते", which is thus ren-

dered by Prof. Gough (in the *Paṇḍit* for Feb. 1873, p. 212):—"The term triad of sheaths has a double connection [with both the preceding and following clauses], after the manner of a lamp placed in the middle of a door [and throwing light both inwards and outwards.]" The following from *Nyâyamanjarî*, page 212, further illustrates the nyâya :—"गृहे दधिघटीं द्रष्टुमानीतो गृहमेधिना । अपूपानपि तद्देशान्प्रकाशयति दीपकः" ॥ Akin to this is मध्यमणिन्याय, which is explained in the *Paṇḍit* for Dec. 1867 as referring to the central ruby of a nose-ring which casts a lustre on the pearl on each side of it.

मानाधीना मेयसिद्धिः ॥

To know the thing to be measured you must know the measure. This is quoted in the opening part of the Akshapâda section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha*:—" मानाधीना मेयसिद्धिरिति न्यायेन प्रमाणस्य प्रथममुद्देशे तदनुसारेण लक्षणस्य कथनीयतया प्रथमोद्दिष्टस्य प्रमाणस्य प्रथमं लक्षणं कथ्यते" ॥ Prof. Cowell's translation is as follows:—"In accordance with the principle that 'to know the thing to be measured you must first know the measure,' proof (pramâṇa) is first enunciated, and as this must be done by defining it, we have first a definition of proof." We find it too, in *Tattvapradîpikâ* (or *Citsukhî*) ii. 18, as follows: "मानाधीना मेयसिद्धिर्मानसिद्धिश्च लक्षणात् । तच्चाध्यक्षादिमानेषु गीर्वाणैरपि दुर्भणम्" ॥ Compare also the following from **Sankshepas'ârîraka* (i. 487):—" मानेन मेयावगतिश्च युक्ता धर्मस्य जाड्याद्विधिनिष्ठकाण्डे । मेयेन मानावगतिस्तु युक्ता वेदान्तवाक्येष्वजडं हि मेयम्" ॥ See, too, *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, page 86, and *Sânkhyakârikâ* 4 (" प्रमेयसिद्धिः प्रमाणाद्धि").

मुञ्जादिषीकोद्धरणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the extraction of the interior spike of the*

---

* Its author, Sarvajnâtmamuni, was a pupil of Sures'varâcârya. See Mr. K. B. Pâṭhak's valuable paper *Bhartṛihari and Kumârila* (1892), page 24.

Munja grass. The following verse from the *Pañcadaśî* (i. 42), with an extract from Râmakṛishṇa's comment thereon will fully explain the meaning and application of the saying:— "यथा मुञ्जादिषीकैवमात्मा युक्त्या समुद्धृतः । शरीरत्रितयाद्धीरैः परं ब्रह्मैव जायते" ॥ "यथा येन प्रकारेण मुञ्जादेतन्नामकात्तृणविशेषादिषीका गर्भस्थं कोमलं तृणं युक्त्या बहिरावरकत्वेन स्थितानां स्थूलपत्राणां विभजनलक्षणेनोपायेन समुद्ध्रियत एवमात्मापि...शरीरत्रितयात्...धीरैः...समुद्धृतः पृथक् कृतश्चेत्स परं ब्रह्मैव जायते" ॥ The illustration is a very ancient one, since it is employed in *S'atapatha Brâhmaṇa* 4. 3. 3. 16, and in *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* vi. 17. The latter instance is as follows:— " तं स्वाच्छरीरात्प्रवृहेन्मुञ्जादिवेषीकां धैर्येण." For the former, see this nyâya in the Superaddenda to *Third Handful.* It is found also in *Bṛihadâraṇyakavârtika* 4. 4. 1277.

याचितकमण्डनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *borrowed ornaments.* Appearing in borrowed plumes. It is well illustrated by *Naiṣadhacarita* vii. 56:— "अस्या मुखश्रीप्रतिबिम्बमेव जलाच्च तातान्मुकुराच्च मित्रात् । अभ्यर्थ्य धत्तः खलु पद्मचन्द्रौ विभूषणं याचितकं कदाचित्" ॥ On which Mallinâtha comments thus:—"याचितकं याच्ञानिर्वृत्तम्। याच्ञयाप्तं याचितकमित्यमरः। अपमित्ययाचिताभ्यां कक्कनाविति कन्प्रत्ययः (Pâṇ. 4. 4. 21) । विभूषणं कदाचिदभ्यर्थ्य धत्तो दधाते खलु । एतदीयमेव सुहृल्लब्धमनयोर्याचितं मण्डनं न स्वाभाविकमित्युत्प्रेक्षा". In the above form the nyâya is found in *Târkikarakṣâ*, page 46:—"तेनायथार्थस्यापि यथार्थानुभवजनितत्वेन यथार्थत्वव्यपदेश इति याचितकमण्डनकमनीयमेव स्मृतेर्याथार्थ्यम्." As याचितमण्डन I have met with it in *Khaṇḍanoddhâra*, page 62, and in *Kâvyapradîpaṭîkâ* of Vaidyanâtha Tatsat, page 173.

लोष्टप्रस्तारन्यायः ॥

This occurs in Abhinavagupta's comment on *Dhvanyâloka* iii. 16 (page 159) in the following sentence:—"तेन लोष्टप्रस्तारन्यायेनानन्तवैचित्र्यमुक्तम्, " and in the first edition I said that it

could only mean the maxim of *an expanse of clods of earth* [as in a roughly ploughed field]. Regarding however प्रस्तार as a mislection for प्रस्तर it would mean the maxim of *a stone and a clod of earth,* and would be synonymous with अश्मलोष्टन्याय of the dictionaries. Mr. M. R. Telang (of the Bombay High Court) has however kindly suggested the following, with which I was quite unfamiliar. He says:—"लोष्ट means a pebble and प्रस्तार a table showing the varieties of metres &c. formed by different arrangements of the short and long syllables in prosody, music &c. The Indians make use of this process to find out the number of varieties of any number of given things. So the meaning of the nyâya can be better explained by the expression the maxim of *the process of permutations and combinations.*

It may be asked what लोष्ट (a pebble) has to do with permutations and combinations. In finding out the number of varieties of any number of given things, a pebble is used for marking certain figures according to the Indian process with the help of प्रस्तार, खण्डमेरु, नष्टोद्दिष्ट &c. These processes are well known to any one conversant with books on Indian music or prosody. The following references to books on the subject will support my statement. *Vide* संगीतरत्नाकर Chap. i verses 61 to 69 (pages 57-60); संगीतदर्पण Chap. i ver. 144 to 154."

वरं सांशयिकान्निष्कादसांशयिकः कार्षापणः ॥

Better is a certain kârshâpaṇa than an uncertain nishka. This and the proverb immediately following are found in the second chapter of Vâtsyâyana's *Kâmasûtra* (page 19), and are the equivalents of our saying "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush."

वरमद्य कपोतः श्वो मयूरात् ॥

Better is a pigeon to-day than a peacock tomorrow. See above.

विपुलकदलीफललिप्सया जिह्वाच्छेदनम् ॥

Cutting off the tongue while trying to get a fine plantain. This is found in the Pûrṇaprajna section of *Sarvadars'ana-sangraha* (page 64 of Bib. Ind., and 75 of Jîvânanda's edn.) as follows:—"एवं च परमेश्वराभेदतृष्णया विष्णोर्गुणोत्कर्षस्य मृगतृष्णिकासमत्वाभिधानं विपुलकदलीफललिप्सया जिह्वाच्छेदनमनुहरत्येतादृशविष्णुविद्वेषणादन्धतमसप्रवेशप्रसङ्गात्" ॥ Prof. Gough renders it thus:—"Thus the statement of those (Advaita-vâdins) in their thirst to be one with the Supreme Lord, that the supreme excellence of Vishṇu is like a mirage, is as if they were to cut off their tongues in trying to get a fine plantain, since it results that through offending this supreme Vishṇu they must enter into the hell of blind darkness."

विषकृमिन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *worms bred in poison* (or, *in manure*). Âpṭe's Dictionary alone gives us this nyâya which he describes as follows:—"It is used to denote a state of things which though fatal to others, is not so to those who, being bred in it, are inured or naturalized to it." In this case it might represent our "What is one man's food is another man's poison." Âpṭe gives no reference to a passage where the maxim is used, and I am indebted for one to that veritable *ratnâkara*, Dr. Böhtlingk's *Indische Sprüche* (6164). It consists of a quotation from *Vṛiddha-Câṇakhya*, a work which appears to exist in MS. only. It runs thus:—

विप्रास्मिन्नगरे महान्कथय कस्तालद्रुमाणां गणः
को दाता रजको ददाति वसनं प्रातर्गृहीत्वा निशि ।
को दक्षः परदारवित्तहरणे सर्वोऽपि दक्षो जनः
कस्माज्जीवसि हे सखे विषकृमिन्यायेन जीवाम्यहम् ॥

The Doctor renders the last line by "Wozu lebst du, o

Freund? Ich lebe nach Art des Mistkäfers (d. i. Ich suche das Beste heraus)." If this is correct, the nyâya must be expressive of "living in clover," or, amidst "marrow and fatness!"

विषवृक्षन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the poisonous tree.* This appears to be based on the second half of *Kumârasambhava* ii. 55 (or *Pañcatantra* i. 245), which runs thus:—"विषवृक्षोऽपि संवर्ध्य स्वयं छेत्तुमसाम्प्रतम्." "It would be improper to cut down even a poisonous tree, after cultivating it oneself." This is used as a maxim by the author of *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya* (page 727) in the following sentence:—"एते सर्वे तर्काः...अस्माभिरेव तर्कपदव्यामभिषिक्तास्ततो न प्रबन्धेन निरस्यन्ते 'विषवृक्षोऽपि संवर्ध्य स्वयं छेत्तुमसाम्प्रतमिति'" ॥ There is another capital instance of it in *Upamitibhavaprapancâ Kathâ*, page 715:—"हा हा मयेदं नो चारु कृतं यत्सुतभर्त्सनम् । विषवृक्षोऽपि संवर्ध्य स्वयं छेत्तुमसाम्प्रतम्" ॥

वीचीतरङ्गन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *wave-undulation.* This is used by the author of the *Bhâshâpariccheda* (verses 165, 166) to account for the production of sound. He says—"सर्वः शब्दो नभोवृत्तिः श्रोत्रोत्पन्नस्तु गृह्यते । वीचीतरङ्गन्यायेन तदुत्पत्तिस्तु कीर्तिता । कदम्बकोरकन्यायादुत्पत्तिः कस्यचिन्मते" ॥ Almost the same words are used by Vedântin Mahâdeva (latter part of 17th century) in his comment on *Sânkhyasûtra* V. 103:- किंतु शब्द एव वीचीतरङ्गन्यायेन कदम्बमुकुलन्यायेन वा श्रोत्रदेशं गतः श्रोत्रेण गृह्यते". "But sound comes to the seat of hearing in the same manner as the undulating waves [of water], or as the anthers of a [globulous] Kadamba-flower and is thus apprehended by the ear." The translation, is Dr. R. Garbe's.

वृद्धकुमारीवाक्यन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the request of the aged spinster.* This is recorded in *Mahâbhâṣya* 8. 2. 3 as follows:—"अथवा वृद्धकुमारीवाक्यवदिदं द्रष्टव्यम् । तद्यथा । वृद्धकुमारीन्द्रेणोक्ता वरं वृणीष्वेति सा वरमवृणीत पुत्रा मे बहुक्षीरघृतमोदनं कांस्यपात्र्यां भुञ्जीरन्निति । न च तावदस्याः पतिर्भवति कुतः पुत्राः कुतो गावः कुतो धान्यम् । तत्रानयैकेन वाक्येन पतिः पुत्रा गावो धान्यमिति सर्वं संगृहीतं भवति" ॥ This would be applied to a sentence having a variety of meanings. In *Tantravârtika* 2. 2. 2 (page 452) we meet with it as वृद्धकुमारीवरप्रार्थन; and in the *Paṇḍit* for December 1867 (page 156) we find exactly the same kind of thing under the heading वृद्धब्राह्मणवरन्यायः. This worthy was not only old but blind, and his request was "स्वपौत्रं राजसिंहासनस्थितमीक्षितुमिच्छामीति."

वृद्धिमिष्टवतो मूलमपि ते नष्टम् ॥

Wishing to grow, you have destroyed your root. This is Prof. Cowell's rendering of the saying as it appears in the *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 27 Bib. Ind., p. 33 Jîvânanda):—"तथा च वृद्धिमिष्टवतो मूलमपि ते नष्टं स्यादिति महत्कष्टमापन्नम्" । In the *Vâcaspatyam,* however, we have the literal and more usual meaning of the nyâya, namely "Whilst seeking to obtain interest, the creditor loses [that and] the capital too." "वृद्धिमिष्टवतो मूलमपि विनष्टमिति न्यायः । वृद्धिर्धनप्रयोगेऽधमर्णात्प्राप्यांशभेदलाभः। तामिष्टवत उत्तमर्णस्याधमर्णदौष्ट्याद्यथा मूलं नश्यत्येवं यत्राभीष्टान्तरसंपादनाय प्रयतमानस्य मूलं नश्यति तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ See also *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya,* p. 31; *Pancadas'î,* vii. 81; *Vedântakalpataru,* page 321; and *Syâdvâdamanjarî,* page 19. An amusing illustration of this saying is found in *Kuvalayânanda,* under the figure विषम. "इष्टार्थमुद्दिश्य किंचित्कर्मारब्धवतो न केवलमिष्टस्यानवाप्तिः किन्तु ततोऽनिष्टस्यापि प्रतिलंभश्चेत्तदपि विषमम् । यथा भक्ष्यप्रेप्सया सर्पपेटिकां दष्ट्वा प्रविष्टस्य मूषकस्य न केवलं भक्ष्यालाभः किन्तु स्वरूप-

हानिरपीति " ॥ Raghunâtha has two other maxims of the same kind, namely, " पुत्रलिप्सया देवं भजन्त्या भर्तापि नष्टः", and " चर्मतन्तौ महिषीं हन्ति."

शरपुरुषीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the man and the arrow.* Vardhamâna explains this, as follows, in his comment on *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 196:—" शरश्च क्षिप्तः प्राकाराच्च पुरुष उत्थितः स तेन हतः। तत्तुल्यं शरपुरुषीयम् " ॥ An arrow is discharged from a bow, and at the same moment a man rises up from behind a wall and is killed by it. It illustrates, therefore, a purely accidental and unforeseen occurrence, and must be classed with the अजाकृपाणीय, खल्वाटबिल्वीय, and others of a like nature.

शर्करोन्मज्जनीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the pebble and the* [man's] *emerging* [from the water]. This, like that immediately preceding, is found in Vardhamâna's work, and on the same page. He explains it thus:—" शर्करा च क्षिप्ता पुरुषस्य चोन्मज्जनं तत्तुल्यं शर्करोन्मज्जनीयम् " ॥ At the moment that the pebble is thrown, a man who has been diving or swimming emerges from the water and is struck by it. This, too, therefore, belongs to the अजाकृपाणीय and काकतालीय category.

शिरश्छेदेऽपि शतं न ददाति विंशतिपञ्चकं तु प्रयच्छतीति शाकटिकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the carter who would be beheaded rather than pay a hundred, but will at once give five score!* It

occurs in the Pûrṇaprajna section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 71 of Bib. Ind. and page 83 of Jîvânanda's) as follows:—"ननु प्रपञ्चस्य मिथ्यात्वमभ्युपेयते नासत्त्वमिति चेत्तदेतत्सोऽयं शिरश्छेदेऽपि शतं न ददाति विंशतिपञ्चकं तु प्रयच्छतीति शाकटिकवृत्तान्तमनुहरेन्मिथ्यात्वासत्वयोः पर्यायत्वादित्यलमतिप्रपञ्चेन" ॥ "If you say that you accept the falsity of the universe, but not its unreality, you are simply acting like the carter who would lose his head rather than pay a hundred pieces of money, but at once gives five score! For falsity and unreality are synonymous. But enough of prolixity."

It is found also in *Âtmatattvaviveka* (page 31), from which Mâdhava probably took it. In *Tattvamuktâkalâpa* ii. 71 (page 244) it takes the form of "शतमदित्सतः शतार्धद्वयदानम्", and there is still another variety of it in *Khaṇḍanoddhâra*, page 74, namely "शिरश्छेदेऽपि काकणीं न ददाति पञ्चगण्डकांस्तु ददाति." Compare with this the following from *Nyâyamanjarî*, page 432:—"अथोच्यते न प्रत्यक्ष आत्मा किंत्वपरोक्ष इति नेदमर्थान्तरवचनं शिशव एवं प्रतार्यन्ते न प्रामाणिकाः" ॥

शीर्षे सर्पो देशान्तरे वैद्यः ॥

A snake in the head, and the doctor in another country! This occurs, in Prâkṛit, in *Karpûramanjarî* iv. (page 100). It is found in somewhat similar form in *Mudrârâkshasa* i. 21, also in Prâkṛit. The *chhâyâ* is as follows. "उपरि घनं घनरटितं दूरे दयिता किमेतदापतितम् । हिमवति दिव्यौषधयः शीर्षे सर्पः समाविष्टः" ॥

शुकनलिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the parrot and the Nalikâ-tree.* Illustrative of causeless fear. In *Udyoga-Parva* xcvi. 42 we read "काकुदीकं शुकं नाकमक्षिसंतर्जनं तथा" । on which the commentator Nîlakaṇṭha says :— "काकुदीकमित्यादयोऽष्टावस्त्रजातयः ।...येन शुकनलिकान्यायेन अभयेऽपि भयदर्शिनो हयरथादिपादेषु गाढं श्लिष्यन्ति तच्छुक-

मोहनं नाम" ॥ I have met with it also in a MS. (No. 233 of 1882-83 in Deccan College, Poona) of Nârâyaṇa's commentary on *Gopâlottaratâpanîya-Upanishad* 8 (corresponding with 21 and 22 of *Bib. Ind.* edition), where, expounding the words "यो हि वै कामेन कामान्कामयते &c.," he says:— "वास्तवं कर्तृभोक्तृत्वं बन्धमोक्षादिकमात्मनो नास्ति किंतु स्वकामपरिकल्पितं शुकनलिकान्यायेन" ॥

शृङ्गग्राहिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *seizing oxen by their horns.* That is, by way of *specification,* and not in the sense of our proverb 'Taking the bull by the horns!' This is very clearly put in Râmakṛishṇa's commentary on S'ankarânanda's *Âtmapurâṇa* iv. 561-2. The text runs thus:—"शास्त्रं चात्र प्रवृत्तं सत्प्रवृत्तिं कुरुते द्विधा। विधानेन निषेधेन लोकदृष्टिसमाश्रयात् ॥ ५६१ ॥ शृङ्गग्राहिकया यद्धि बोधयेत्तद्विधायकम्। यथा लोके करे तेऽस्ति फलमित्यादिभाषणम् ॥ ५६२ ॥" On the latter verse, Râmakṛishṇa says:—"तत्र विधायकशास्त्रस्य लक्षणं लौकिकमुदाहरणं चाह शृङ्गेति। शृङ्गस्य ग्रहणं यस्यां क्रियायां सा शृङ्गग्राहिका। संज्ञायामिति ण्वुल्। (Pâṇ. 3. 3. 108-9) । यथा गोव्रजे का मदीया गौरिति गोपः पृष्टः शृङ्गं गृहीत्वा गां प्रदर्शयेत्तथाबोधकं शास्त्रं विधायकमुच्यते" ॥ So too, in Sures'vara's vârtika on *Bṛihadâraṇyakopanishadbhâshya* 1. 4. 866:—"शृङ्गग्राहिकया श्रुत्या ब्रह्मतापोदिता स्फुटम्", on which Ânandagiri says:—"यथा गोमण्डलस्थां गां शृङ्गं गृहीत्वा विशेषतो दर्शयत्येषा बहुक्षीरेति &c." The same sense is attached to the maxim in Nîlakaṇṭha on *Udyoga-Parva* XLV. 9 ("मदोऽष्टादशदोषः स स्यात्पुरा योऽप्रकीर्तितः") where we read:—"अप्रकीर्तित इति दमविरोधिन एव प्रातिकूल्यादयो मददोषत्वेन सूचिता अपि शृङ्गग्राहिकया प्रकर्षेण विधिमुखेन न प्रोक्ता इत्यर्थः" ॥ A fourth instance of the employment of this maxim in the same sense is found in the metrical comment on *S'âṇḍilya-sûtra* 87:—"न तावत्समवायेन भेदसंबन्धगौरवात्। शब्दानां समयोऽप्येवं शृङ्गग्राहिकया लघुः" ॥ The passage is translated by Prof. Cowell as follows:—"It will not do to hold that the connexion between the cause and its effect may be that

called 'Intimate relation,' and not that called 'Identity,'— because it is a much more cumbrous assumption than ours and involves the connexion of 'difference;' and by our own we easily get at the true meaning of the various S'ruti passages,— seizing them one by one, as oxen by their horns." In a footnote he adds :—" That is, such passages as 'Uktha is Brahman,' 'Prâṇa is Brahman' &c. *S'ṛingagrâhikânyâya* is a proverb sometimes explained as 'catching an unruly bull first by securing one horn and then the second,' and sometimes, 'driving many oxen into a stall, by seizing them one by one by their horns'." In *Bhâmatî* 3. 2. 22 (page 566) we have the phrase again :—" यथा गवाद्यो विषयाः साक्षाच्छृङ्गग्राहिकया प्रतिपाद्यन्ते प्रतीयन्ते च नैवं ब्रह्म" ॥ Mr. F. W. Thomas has pointed out to me the शीर्षग्रहणन्याय which is quoted in the commentary on Daṇḍin's *Kâvyâdars'a* ii. 368. I think its usage must be similar to that of the above.

श्येनकपोतीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the hawk and the pigeon.* Vardhamâna, in *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 195, explains it in the following way :—" श्येनकपोतयोरिव श्येनकपोतीयो दुर्योगः । यथा कपोतोऽतर्कितमागतेन श्येनेन गृहीतस्तथाकस्मिको यो दुर्योगः स एवमुच्यते" ॥ This must be classed therefore with शरपुरुषीय and others of a similar kind. We have a श्येनकपोतीयमुपाख्यानं given in the table of contents which forms the opening part of the *Mahâbhârata*, and the story will be found in *Vanaparva* cxcvi. There is another in chapter cxxxi.

श्वश्रूनिर्गच्छोक्तिन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the mother-in-law who said, 'Be off.'* This quaint illustration appears in Sures'vara's *Naishkarmyasiddhi*

i. 28, as follows:—"अभ्युपगताभ्युपगमाच्च श्वश्रूनिर्गच्छोक्तिवद्भवतो निष्प्रयोजनः प्रलापः" ॥ "And since you now express agreement with that which we also acknowledge, your protracted discussion was as unreasonable as was the mother-in-law's saying [to the mendicant] 'Be off.'' The commentator, Jnânottama, explains this in the following manner:—"भिक्षामटते माणवकाय भिक्षां प्रत्याचक्षाणामात्मनः स्नुषां भर्त्सयित्वा श्वश्रूः पुनस्तमाहूय समागते तस्मिन्नास्ति भिक्षा निर्गच्छेति तथैव प्रत्याचष्टे" ॥ "After abusing her daughter-in-law for refusing to give alms to a wandering mendicant, the mother-in-law called him back, and, when he had come, said to him, 'There are no alms, be off,' thus refusing also herself!'

सिंहावलोकनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a lion's glance.* This is based on a lion's habit of looking in front and behind, after killing its prey, to see if there is any rival to dispute possession! It is applied, says Târânâtha, where a word in a sentence is connected with what precedes and with that which follows it. It is not, however, restricted to this. The expression occurs four times in the *Taittirîya-Prâtis'âkhya,* namely in ii. 51, iv. 4, xiii. 3 and 15. Prof. Whitney remarks as follows on the first instance of its occurrence:—" The 'and' of this rule [वर्गवचैषु], the commentator says, brings forward, on the principle of 'the lion's look' (a distant glance backward), the already defined organs of production of the various mute series." It is found also in Nîlakaṇṭha's comment on *Vanaparva* ccxxi. 1 (गुरुभिर्नियमैर्जातो भरतो नाम पावकः) :—" सिंहावलोकनन्यायेन शंयोः पौत्रमूर्जपुत्रं भरतं स्तौति सार्धेन गुरुभिरिति" ॥ It was a favourite maxim of Vâcaspatimis'ra's, and I have met with it eight times in three of his writings. It occurs in *Bhâmatî* 2. 3. 6 (page 473); in *Sânkhyatattvakaumudî*, 7 (page 36); and in *Nyâyavârtika-tâtparyaṭîkâ,* pages 97, 199, 230, 322, 403, 405. An example of a different kind is found in Hemachandra's *Paris'ishṭaparvan,* i. 63:—"सिंहावलोकनन्यायेनालीढः क्षत्रतेजसा । प्रत्यक्षानिव सोऽद्राक्षीत्तानमात्यान्सुतद्विपः " ॥

सूचीकटाहन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the needle and the boiler.* It is explained as follows in Molesworth's Marâṭhî dictionary :—" A phrase used as an illustration upon the occasion of two matters of which the one is superlatively simple and easy, or altogether insignificant, and the other indefinitely greater, more difficult, or more important, arising at once to be done ; and of which it is intended to intimate that the trifling one should be despatched first." It occurs in the opening part of chapter iv of *Kâvyapradîpa*, and again on page 70. Also in the commentary on *Sâhityakaumudî* iv. 1, where the same *kârikâ* is expounded. The following is from the *Saptapadârthî*, page 21. The text runs thus:— " अनुभवोऽपि द्विविधः । प्रमाऽप्रमा च । अप्रमापि संशयो विपर्ययश्च । प्रमा प्रत्यक्षमनुमितिश्च " ॥ On which the commentator remarks :—" प्रमानिरूप्यत्वात्परस्ताद्विभक्तामप्यप्रमां सूचीकटाहन्यायेन प्राग्विभजतेऽप्रमापीति" ॥ There is another good example of the maxim, with a lucid translation by Dr. Ballantyne, in the introduction to Book ii of his *Aphorisms of the Nyâya.*

स्थालीपुलाकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the rice in the cooking-pot.* " In a cooking-pot all the grains being equally moistened by the heated water, when one grain is found to be well cooked the same may be inferred with regard to the other grains. So the maxim is used when the condition of the whole class is inferred from that of a part." (Apṭe's Sanskrit Dictionary). It is therefore equivalent to "*Ex uno disce omnes.*" Patanjali seems to have laid the foundation of the nyâya in the following words, in *Mahâbhâṣya* 1. 4. 23 (vart. 15) :—" पर्याप्तो ह्येकः पुलाकः स्थाल्या निदर्शनाय." ॥ Then we find it in Jaimini 7. 4. 12, the sûtra with a portion of S'abara's bhâṣya being as follows :— " लिङ्गस्य पूर्ववत्त्वाच्चोदनाशब्दसामान्यादेकेनापि निरूप्येत यथा स्थालीपुलाकेन ॥ ......एतन्न्यायपूर्वकं लिङ्गमेकत्रापि दृश्यमानं तुल्यन्यायानां सर्वेषां धर्मवत्तां ज्ञापयति । यथा स्थाल्यां तुल्यपाकानां पुलाकानामेकमुपमृद्यान्येषामपि सिद्धतां जानाति." ॥

Other instances of its occurrence are *Tantravârtika* 3. 5. 19; *Vedântakalpataru*, page 446; *Kalpatarûparimala*, pages 115, 468, 667, 685; and *Tattvamuktâkalâpa*, 293. Of similar import is the following line from Hemachandra's *Parisiṣṭaparva* vii. 94:—"सिक्थेनापि द्रोणपाकं जानन्ति हि मनीषिणः" ॥

स्थूणानिखननन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the driving in of a post.* As a post is driven into the ground by repeated efforts, so a position is strengthened by the bringing forward of a succession of facts or arguments. It occurs three times in S'ankara's bhâshya on the *Vedântasûtras*, as follows:—"पुनश्च जगज्जन्मादिहेतुत्वमीश्वरस्याक्षिप्यते स्थूणानिखननन्यायेन प्रतिज्ञातस्यार्थस्य दृढीकरणाय" 2. 1. 34. "आक्षेपपूर्विका हि परिहारोक्तिर्विवक्षितेऽर्थे स्थूणानिखननन्यायेन दृढां बुद्धिमुत्पादयति" 3. 3. 53. "सत्यं प्रसाधितं तस्यैव तु स्थूणानिखननवत्फलद्वारेणाक्षेपसमाधाने क्रियेते दार्ढ्याय" 3. 4. 2. But S'abara seems to have originated it in his bhâshya on Jaimini 7. 2. 1.

स्वाङ्गं स्वव्यवधायकं न भवति ॥

One's own body does not hinder one. It is found at the end of the Akshapâda section of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha*, as follows:—"न च स्वातन्त्र्यभङ्गः शङ्कनीयः स्वाङ्गं स्वव्यवधायकं न भवतीति न्यायेन प्रत्युत तन्निर्वाहात्" "Nor need you object that this would interfere with God's own independence [as He would thus seem to depend on others' actions], since there is the well-known saying, 'One's own body does not hinder one;' nay rather it helps to carry out one's aims." This is Professor Cowell's translation.

Other instances of its employment are *Bhâmatî* 3. 4. 20 (page 682); *Tâtparyaṭîkâ*, pp. 72, 90; *Târkikarakṣâṭîkâ*, page 50; *Nyâyamakarandaṭîkâ*, pp. 201, 215; and *Khaṇḍanoddhâra*, pages 58, 62.

लौकिकन्यायाञ्जलिः ॥

द्वितीयो भागः ॥

SECOND HANDFUL OF POPULAR MAXIMS.

Price 12 Annas.

लौकिकन्यायाञ्जलिः ॥

द्वितीयो भागः ॥

A SECOND HANDFUL OF POPULAR MAXIMS

CURRENT IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE.

COLLECTED BY

Colonel G. A. Jacob,

INDIAN ARMY.

Author of "Concordance to the Principal Upanishads," "Manual of Hindu Pantheism," &c., &c.

SECOND EDITION—REVISED AND ENLARGED.

PUBLISHED BY

TUKÂRÂM JÂVAJÎ,

PROPRIETOR "NIRNAYA-SÂGAR" PRESS.

Bombay:

1909.

Registered under the Act XXV of 1867.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The issue, in Benares seven years ago, of an edition of Raghunāthavarma's *Laukikanyāyasangraha,* has made it unnecessary to reprint the Preface to the former edition of the present Handful, seeing that a good part of it was devoted to a description of that then-unpublished treatise. For the same reason I have omitted the appended list of nyāyas contained in Raghunātha's work, and which, at no small expenditure of time and toil, I compiled from the two MSS. in the India Office Library.

The whole of the explanatory matter attached to the nyāyas has been thoroughly revised for this edition, and, in some cases, has been re-written. In addition to this the book will be found to contain thirty-two new nyāyas, some of them of considerable importance, and all of them more or less interesting. The six Systems seem to be the most attractive part of the field for the study of similes of the class which predominates in these pages; but grammatical commentaries also, appear likely to prove a not unfruitful field to the painstaking explorer.

For the reasons given in the preface to the Third Handful I would gladly have seized this opportunity of eliminating the word 'Maxims' from the titlepage; but it was not politic to change the name adopted ten years ago and repeated in each new issue.

It is not probable that this will pass into a third edition during my lifetime; but I trust that in its present form it may prove helpful to young students whose reading has not bene quite so wide as my own.

REDHILL, SURREY,
23 Sept. 1909.

G. A. JACOB.

List of additional authors quoted in the following pages.

Āgamaprāmāṇya of Yāmunācārya Swāmin (Rāmānuja's Paramaguru = guru's guru); Medical Hall Press, Benāres 1900.

Ātmabodha of S'ankarācārya, edited, with Commentary, by Fitzedward Hall; Mirzapur, 1852.

Ātmatattvaviveka of Udayana, with four Commentaries; Bib. Ind. Series, Part i, 1907. See also First Handful.

Bodhicaryāvatāra of S'āntideva, with the Com. of Prajnākaramati, edited by Prof. L. de la Vallèe Poussin; Bib. Ind. Series, 1901-1907. Incomplete.

Gauḍapāda's kārikās on *Māṇḍūkya-Upaniṣad;* Ānandās'rama Sanskrit Series, Poona, 1890.

Indian Thought, a quarterly Magazine edited by Dr. G. Thibaut and Prof. Gangānātha Jhā; Allahabad, 1907.

Kiraṇāvali of Udayana, on Pras'astapāda's *bhāṣya;* Benares Sanskrit Series, 1885 and 1897. A mere fragment.

Kīrtikaumudī of Somes'varadeva, edited by Ābājī Vishṇu Kāthavaṭe; Bombay, 1883.

Laukikanyāyaratnākara of Raghunāthavarman; India Office MS. 582.

Madhyamakavṛitti of Candrakīrti on Nāgārjuna's kārikās, edited by Prof. L. de la Vallèe Poussin; Bibliotheca Buddhica, St. Petersburg, 1903-1907. Incomplete.

Mahābhāṣya with the *Pradīpa* of Kaiyaṭa, and Nāges'a's *Uddyota*; edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Pandit S'ivadatta D. Kudāla; vol. i (Navāhnika); Nirṇayasāgar Press 1908. A fine edition.

Mahābhāṣyapradīpoddyota of Nāges'a Bhatta, in course of

publication in Bib. Ind. Series, Calcutta; Vols. i and ii; and part of iii, already issued.

Medinī, a dictionary of homonymous words, edited by Somanāth Mukhopādhyāya; Calcutta, 1869.

Nītis'ataka of Bhartṛihari; Nirṇayasāgar Press, Bombay, Saṃvat 1947.

Nyāyadīpāvali of Ānandabodhācārya, published together with Nyāyamakaranda in Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1907.

Nyāyamālāvistara of Mādhavācārya; Ānandās'rama Sanskrit Series, 1892.

Nyāyamanjarīsāra, a Commentary on *Nyāyasiddhāntamanjarī*; The Paṇḍit, 1907.

Nyāyasiddhānjana of Venkanṭanāth (of Rāmānuja's School); Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1901.

Pancapādikāvivaraṇa of Prakās'ātma Yati; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, Saṃvat 1948.

Paramārthasāra of S'esha; Lucknow, 1876.

Paribhāṣendus'ekhara, Text and translation; Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1868—74.

Prabandhacintāmaṇi of Merutunga; Bombay, 1888. Translation by Mr. C. H. Tawney; Bib. Ind. Series, 1901.

Pramāṇamālā of Ānandabodhācārya, published with Nyāyadīpavali, as above.

Sāhityadarpaṇa of Vis'vanātha Kavirāja, edited by Dr. Roer; Bib. Ind. 1851. Translation by Dr. Ballantyne and Mr. Pramadadāsa Mitra; Bib. Ind. 1875.

S'ālikā, or *Prakaraṇapancikā*, a treatise on Mīmāṃsā according to the school of Prabhākara, by S'ālikānātha; Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series, 1903. Originally published in the Paṇḍit, 1866—7. Portions of the work are missing.

Sambandhavārtika of Sures'varācārya, translated by S. Venkaṭaramaṇa Aiyar, B. A.; Medical Hall Press, 1905.

Sarvārthasiddhi, Venkaṭanātha's vṛitti on his own work Tattvamuktākalāpa, for which see First Handful of Maxims.

S'lokavārtika of Kumārila, with Pārthasārathi's ṭīkā; Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1898. Translation by Prof. Gangānāth Jhā; Bib. Ind. Series, 1907.

S'ribhāṣya of Rāmānuja, with Sudars'anācārya's ṭīkā, reprinted from the Paṇḍit, 3 vols. 1889-91. An edition of the text only, edited by Rev. J. J. Johnson of Benares, is now nearing completion in the Paṇḍit. Translation by Dr. G. Thibaut in Sacred Books of East Series, 1904.

Tarkabhāṣā of Kes'ava Mis'ra, with the ṭīkā entitled *Nyāyapradīpa* of Vis'vakarman; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1901.

Tattvabindu, a treatise on Mīmāṃsa, by Vācaspati Mis'ra; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1892.

Tattvadīpana of Akhaṇḍānanda Muni, a commentary on Pancapādikāvivaraṇa; Benares Sanskrit Series, 1902.

Vaiyāsikanyāyamālā on the Vedāntasūtras; Ānandās'rama Sanskrit Series, Poona, 1891.

Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛihari, kāṇḍas i and ii, Benares Sanskrit Series. 1887. An edition of kāṇḍa iii, otherwise styled *Prakīrṇaka*, has been commenced in the same Series.

Vedantaparibhāṣā, with the *S'ikhāmaṇi* and the ṭīkā of Amaradāsa; Venkaṭes'vara Press, Bombay, 1901. Translation of the Paribhāṣā by Mr. A. Venis in the Paṇḍit, 1882—85.

Vidhirasāyaṇa, a work on Mīmāṃsā, by Appai Dīkṣita; Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series, 1901.

Vishṇu Purāṇa, with S'rīratnagarbha Bhaṭṭa's *Candrikā* entitled Vaiṣṇavākūta; Krishṇa S'āstrī Gurjara's Press, Bombay.

CORRIGENDA.

Page 26, line 8. For "ts" say "as". Thisunsightly error crept in after the corrected proof had left my hands !

Page 28, line 16. For दृग्धा read दृष्ट्वा.

Page 30, line 11 from bottom. After वा insert प्रयोजनम्.

A SECOND HANDFUL OF POPULAR MAXIMS.

अजातपुत्रनामोत्कीर्तनन्यायः ॥

Proclaiming the name of a son before he is born. That is, counting your chickens before they are hatched. The nyāya, in a negative form, is found in the *Nyāyamanjarī*, page 345:—"यश्चासौ व्यापारः क्रियते चाभिधीयते च स किं पूर्वमभिधीयते ततः क्रियते पूर्वं वा क्रियते पश्चादभिधीयते युगपदेव वास्य करणाभिधाने इति । न तावत्पूर्वमभिधीयतेऽनुत्पन्नस्याभिधानानुपपत्तेः । न ह्यजाते पुत्रे नामधेयकरणम्" ॥

अणुरपि विशेषोऽध्यवसायकरः ॥

Even a slight difference [between two or more things or expressions] *establishes the fact* [that they do differ, and enables us to discriminate between them]. After explaining the पुष्टलगुडन्याय and nine others of similar purport, Raghunātha says:—"पुष्टलगुडन्यायादारभ्यैतत्पर्यन्तानां न्यायानां साम्येऽपि यत्किंचिद्विशेषमादायाणुरपि विशेषोऽध्यवसायकर इति न्यायेन भेदसिद्धिर्भिन्नोदाहरणत्वसिद्धिश्च केषांचिदिति बोध्यम्." The nyāya occurs in Mathurānātha's commentary on the opening paragraph of *Ātmatattvaviveka* (page 19), where, after stating that, according to the Buddhists, moksa is brought about by the knowledge of the non-existence of soul, he says:—"तदुक्तम् । नैरात्म्यदृष्टिं मोक्षस्य हेतुं केचन मन्वते । आत्मतत्त्वधियं त्वन्ये न्यायतत्त्वानुसारिणः ॥ इति । न च तत्र नैरात्म्यदृष्टिपदं शरीरात्मभिन्नतत्वज्ञानपरमिति वाच्यम् । निरः संसर्गाभावबोधकतया तादृशज्ञानस्य तदर्थत्वासंभवात् । न्यायमते च मोक्षाश्रयमुख्यविशेष्यकतया अणुरपि विशेषोऽध्यवसायकर इति न्यायेनात्मविशेष्यकशरीरादिभिन्नत्वज्ञानस्यैव मोक्षहेतुत्वादिति ध्येयम्."

अत्यन्तपराजयाद्वरं संशयोऽपि ॥

Better even a doubtful condition of things than a crushing defeat. This occurs in the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā* 5. 1. 43. (page 491):—" यदि त्वस्य कदाचित्सम्यक्साधनवादिनोऽपि प्रतिभाक्षयात्समाधानं न स्फुरति ततोऽत्यन्तपराजयाद्वरं संशयोऽपीति न्यायेन समाधानाभासेनापि प्रत्यवस्थेयमेवेत्याशयवानाह तेषां साध्वसाधुतायामिति " ॥ On page 473 of the same, and in *Nyāyamanjarī*, page 620, it appears as एकान्तपराजयाद्वरं सन्देहः ॥ It is not in any of the lists of nyāyas to which I have had access, but Raghunāthavarman has two of the same purport, namely " मारणाय गृहीतोऽङ्गच्छेदं स्वीकरोति " (which see below), and " मरणाद्वरं व्याधिः "; and, in *Nyāyamālāvistara* 6. 2. 7. Mādhava gives us "प्रधानलोपाद्वरमङ्गलोपः" ॥ All of these seem akin to our " Half a loaf is better than no bread. "

अध्यारोपापवादन्यायः ॥

The method of *illusory attribution followed by its withdrawal.* This nyāya belongs entirely to the Vedāntists, but I follow Raghunātha in admitting it here. The two terms are explained as follows in the *Vedāntasāra*:—"Illusory attribution is the attributing to the real of that which is unreal; as a snake is imagined in a rope which is not a snake." "The withdrawal is the assertion that the whole of the unreal, beginning with Ignorance, which is an illusory effect of the Real, is nothing but the Real; just as a snake, which is the illusory effect of a rope is nothing whatsoever but the rope." This rendering is from my *Manual of Hindu Pantheism*, pages 44 and 83. On page 42, there is the following note which includes a quotation from page 209 of that valuable book *A Rational Refutation of Hindu Philosophical Systems*:—

"12. *Illusory attribution* &c. (*adhyāropāpavāda*).

In order to describe the pure abstraction Brahma, the teacher

attributes to him, or superimposes on him, certain qualities which in reality do not belong to him, and then afterwards withdrawing them, teaches that the residuum is the undifferenced Absolute. When the Vedāntins speak of the origin of the world, they do not believe its origin to be true. This mode of expression they call false imputation (*adhyāropa*). It consists in holding for true that which is false, in accommodation to the intelligence of the uninitiated. At a further stage of instruction, when the time has arrived for propounding the esoteric view, the false imputation is gainsaid, and this gainsaying is termed rescission (*apavāda*)."

See also a long note on page 172 of the text of the *Vedāntasāra.* The verse in the *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi,* there referred to, should be 140 instead of 170.

अन्धदर्पणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a looking-glass for a blind man.* It is found in *Upamitibhavaprapancā Kathā,* page 836, as follows:—"केवलं ज्ञातशास्त्रोऽपि स्वावस्थां यो न बुध्यते । तस्याकिञ्चित्करं ज्ञानमन्धस्येव सुदर्पणः" ॥ See also S'eṣānantācārya on *Nyāyasiddhāntadīpa,* page 22, line 2. The *Laukikanyāyaratnākara* gives the following example:—"तदुक्तं वासिष्ठे । यस्य नास्ति स्वयं प्रज्ञा शास्त्रं तस्य करोति किम् । लोचनाभ्यां विहीनस्य दर्पणः किं करिष्यति" ॥ I have no doubt that the reference is to the *Yogavāsishṭha,* but the verse is also found in the *Hitopades'a* (iii., 115). See, too, under अरण्यरोदनन्याय.

अन्धस्येवान्धलग्नस्य विनिपातः पदे पदे ॥

One who leans on a blind man will fall with him at every step. This is akin to the saying "If the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the ditch." It occurs in *Bhāmatī* (page 20)

as follows:—" योऽयमर्थप्रकाशः फलं यस्मिन्नर्थश्चात्मा च प्रथेते स किं जडः स्वयंप्रकाशो वा । जडश्चेद्विषयात्मानावपि जडाविति कस्मिन् किं प्रकाशेताविशेषादिति प्राप्तमान्ध्यमशेषस्य जगतः । तथा चाभाणकः । अन्धस्येवान्धलग्नस्य विनिपातः पदे पदे" ॥ Compare the following expression in Venkaṭanātha's vritti on his *Tattvamuktākalāpa* iii. 50:—" इति चान्धस्य जात्यन्धयष्टिदानोपमं विदुः " ॥ Though not exactly parallel with the nyāya, the following verse of Jayanta's (page 120) will not be out of place here:— " हस्तस्पर्शादिनान्धेन विषमे पथि धावता । अनुमानप्रधानेन विनिपातो न दुर्लभः " ॥

अपराद्धेषोरिव धानुष्कस्य कण्ठाडम्बरः ॥

Noisy boasting like that of an [unskilful] *archer whose arrows always miss the mark.* This simile occurs in the *Ātmatattvaviveka* (page 49), but was no doubt borrowed from Māgha ii. 27:—

" अनिर्लोडितकार्यस्य वाग्जालं वाग्मिनो वृथा ।
निमित्तादपराद्धेषोर्धानुष्कस्येव वल्गितम् " ॥

" The chatter of a talkative man who has no knowledge of affairs, is as useless as the swaggering of an archer whose arrows always miss the mark."

अरण्यरोदनन्यायः ॥

The simile of *crying in the wilderness.* Used to imply wasted effort. Molesworth defines it as "A term for unregarded or unavailing complaint or supplication." The following verse from Namisādhu's comment on Rudraṭa's *Kāvyālankāra* viii. 37 includes not only this nyāya but also Raghunātha's शवोद्वर्तनन्याय, ऊषरवृष्टिन्याय, श्वपुच्छोन्नामनन्याय, बधिरकर्णजपन्याय, and

probably his अन्धदर्पणन्याय; for Dr. Böhtlingk, who quotes the verse as from *Pancatantra*, gives घृतोऽन्धमुखदर्पणः as a variant for कृतान्धमुखमण्डना.

अरण्यरुदितं कृतं शवशरीरमुद्वर्तितं
स्थले कमलरोपणं सुचिरमूषरे वर्षितम् ।
श्वपुच्छमवनामितं बधिरकर्णजापः कृतः
कृतान्धमुखमण्डना यदबुधो जनः सेवितः ॥

See also *Pancatantra* i. 393; *Kiraṇāvali* page 5; and *Kusumānjali*, vol. ii, page 176.

अर्थी समर्थो विद्वानधिक्रियते ॥

He has the right who has the want, the power, and the wit. This nyāya is found in the Jaimini section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* as follows:—"अर्थी समर्थो विद्वानधिक्रियत इति न्यायेन दर्शपूर्णमासादिविषयावबोधमेवक्षमाणास्तत्त्वबोधे स्वाध्यायं विनियुञ्जते" ॥ Professor Cowell translated it thus:—"According to the old rule 'He has the right who has the want, the power, and the wit,' those who are aiming to understand certain things, as the new and full-moon sacrifices, use their daily reading to learn the truth about them."

The saying is found in a more complete form in *Vaiyāsikanyāyamālā* 1. 3. 9, namely, "अर्थी समर्थो विद्वाञ्शास्त्रेणापर्युदस्तोऽधिक्रियते," which is itself a reproduction of the following passage in *S'ānkarabhāṣya* 1. 3. 25:—"शास्त्रं ह्यविशेषप्रवृत्तमपि मनुष्यानेवाधिकरोति शक्तत्वादर्थित्वादपर्युदस्तत्वादुपनयनादिशास्त्राच्चेति वर्णितमेतदधिकारलक्षणे." Dr. Thibaut renders it thus:—"The S'āstra, although propounded without distinction (*i. e.* although not itself specifying what class of beings is to proceed according to its precepts), does in reality entitle men only (to act according to its precepts); for men only (of the three higher castes) are, firstly, capable (of complying with the precepts of the S'āstra);

are, secondly, desirous (of the results of actions enjoined by the S'āstra); are, thirdly, not excluded by prohibitions; and are, fourthly, subject to the precepts about the *Upanayana* ceremony and so on. This point has been explained in the section treating of the definition of *adhikāra* (Pūrva Mīmāṁsā vi. 1)." For the last-mentioned, see under अधिकारन्याय in the third Handful. This question of अर्थित्व &c. will be found also in *S'ānkarabhāṣya* 1. 1. 4 (page 54); 1. 3. 26, 33, 34; and 2. 2. 10.

अर्धवैशसन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the slaying of one half* [of a body, whilst the other half is kept alive !]. Raghunāthavarman defines it as follows:—" असंभवविवक्षायामर्धवैशसन्यायः । यथा कुक्कुटीमांसभोजनकामस्तत्सन्ततिकामश्च कश्चिद्यवनस्तद्ग्रीवादिकं छित्त्वा भुंक्त उदरं च सन्तानार्थं स्थापयतीति तस्यार्थः" ॥ The nyāya is therefore expressive of absurdity, contradiction, or incongruity; and so, in some respects, resembles the अर्धजरतीयन्याय. The earliest example, known to me, of the use of the term is in *Kumārasambhava* iv. 31, where Rati complains that, by destroying Kāma, Fate had slain half of herself. The verse stands thus:—" विधिना कृतमर्धवैशसं ननु मां कामवधे विमुञ्चता । अनपायिनि संश्रयद्रुमे गजभग्ने पतनाय वल्लरी " ॥ Mallinātha points out that as the slaying of a part involves that of the whole, Rati here announces her own destruction also, as is clearly implied in the second half of the verse. Its employment here by Kālidāsa, however, is in a literal sense, whilst the philosophical writers apply it figuratively.

In the latter part of S'ankara's bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra* 3. 3. 18 we find the expression " न ह्यर्धवैशसं संभवति ", and I have noted it in *Tantravārtika*, pages 84, 89, 97 and 202. The first of the four passages is the following:—"अविरोधे श्रुतिमूलं न मूलान्तरसंभवः । विरोधे त्वन्यमूलत्वमिति स्यादर्धवैशसम् " ॥ In this passage, as well as in the other three, contradiction or inconsistency

is clearly implied. So, too, in a passage in *Nyāyakandali*, page 6, line 3; and in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya*, page 685. One more example will suffice, namely *Bṛihadāraṇyavārtika* 1. 4. 1276:—" न चार्धवैशसं युक्तं तत्त्वज्ञाने विवक्षिते । संशयो हि तथा श्रोतुः स्यादनिश्चितवाक्यतः " ॥ Ānandagiri explains this in the manner stated above by Raghunātha, viz. " कुक्कुटादेरेको देशः प्रसवाय कल्पते पच्यते देशान्तरमित्यर्धवैशसं तदिहायुक्तं नहि वस्तु ब्रह्म चाब्रह्म च तत्त्वज्ञानस्य विवक्षितत्वाद्विरुद्धस्यातथात्वादित्यर्थः " ॥

अलाभे मत्तकाशिन्या दृष्टा तिर्यक्षु कामिता ॥

Failing to obtain a lovely woman, affection is seen [to have been lavished] *on animals.* This very stupid nyāya is expounded by Raghunātha as follows:—" यत्राधिकार्थालाभेऽल्पार्थे प्रवृत्तिर्न दोषायेति विवक्षायां तत्रालाभे मत्तकाशिन्या दृष्टा तिर्यक्षु कामितेति न्यायः । मत्तकाशिनी स्त्रीविशेषः " ॥ I have met with it only in the *Ātmatattvaviveka* (page 130) and in Ānandabodhācārya's *Pramāṇamālā*, page 2.

अश्वतरीगर्भन्यायः ॥

The simile of *a she-mule's being in foal.* Raghunātha explains it thus:—" नन्वज्ञानकार्यान्तःकरणवृत्त्यात्मकं ज्ञानं कथं स्वकारणीभूताज्ञाननाशाय स्यादुपजीव्यविरोधादिति चेदश्वतरीगर्भन्यायादित्यवेहि । बडवायां गर्दभादुत्पन्नाश्वतरी तस्या गर्भो यथा तन्नाशाय भवति तथा भवतु ज्ञानमपि स्वहेत्वज्ञाननाशायेत्यनवद्यम् " ॥ The following verse, bearing on this subject, is found in *Hitopades'a*, ii. 135, *Pancatantra*, ii. 32 and iv. 14:—" सकृद्दुष्टं तु यन्मित्रं पुनः सन्धातुमिच्छति । स मृत्युमेव गृह्णाति गर्भमश्वतरी यथा " ॥ As Dr. Peterson points out in his Note on the verse from *Hitopades'a*, the second line is found in *Ādiparva* (Bombay edn.) CXL. 83 (not 75, as wrongly printed), and in *S'āntiparva* CXL. 30 (not 347 as stated). In a footnote to *Indische Sprüche* 58, Dr. Böhtlingk quotes Nīlakaṇṭha's comment on the verse from *S'āntiparva*—

"अश्वतरी गर्दभजाश्वा उदरभेदेनैव प्रसूत इति प्रसिद्धम्." Of like import are two other nyāyas quoted by Raghunātha, namely कदलीफलन्याय and वृश्चिकीगर्भन्याय. As to the former of these, compare the following, *Vanaparva* CCLXVIII. 9 (Bombay edn.):— "यथा च वेणुः कदली नलो वा फलत्यभावाय न भूतयेत्मनः। तथैव मां तैः परिरक्ष्यमाणामादास्यसे कर्कटकीव गर्भम्" ॥ This verse is quoted by Johnson in his Notes on *Hitopades'a* II. 147, and he adds, "In the Gulistān, the Persian poet Sāadi declares that the young of the scorpion eats its way out through the mother's entrails"; and in *Vedāntakalpataru*, page 354, line 2, we are told "वृश्चिकादिर्मातुरुदरं निर्भिद्य मृताज्जायते." Udayana (in *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 67, line 9) seems to assert the same thing of the crab:— "कुलीरस्येव सप्रसूतयुत्त्यापत्येनैव प्रतिहतत्वात्."

अहिभुक्कैवर्तन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the opium-eater and the fisherman*. I have not met with this in actual use in the literature, but include it on the authority of Raghunāthavarman, whose interpretation of it, however, seems most improbable. The word अहि is said by him to mean "an intoxicating plant, known in the language of the West as *Post*" ("उन्मादकर औषधिविशेषः पोस्तेति पाश्चात्त्यभाषायाम्"). This meaning of अहि is unknown to the lexicographers; but, in Bate's Hindi dictionary, पोस्त is said to mean "the poppy-plant; an infusion of the poppy formerly much used as a slow poison;" whilst Fallon defines it as "Poppy-head or capsule; an intoxicating drug." We must take अहि therefore in the sense of अहिफेन which is the original of the modern अफीम, opium. The story on which the maxim is said to be based is as follows:—"अहिभुक्कैवर्तन्यायस्तु तादात्म्याध्यास एव ज्ञेयः। श्रूयते हि लोके कश्चिदहिभुन्नावमारुरोह स च तत्र बहुजनसमुदायं दृष्ट्वा केनचिन्मे विनिमयो न स्यादिति धिया स्वपादे रज्जुं बद्ध्वा तन्द्रां प्राप। कैवर्तश्चोपहासार्थं तत्पादात्तां मोचयित्वा स्वपादे बबन्ध। नाविपारं गतायामवरोहणसमयेऽहिभुक्स्वपादे रज्जुमदृष्ट्वा कैवर्तपादे च तां दृष्ट्वाहमयमयमहमिति स्वहृदि निश्चित्यारे कैवर्त त्वमहमहं च त्वमिति तेन विवादं कृतवान्" ॥ This nonsense is meant to teach the identity of the individual with the one Self!

आदावन्ते च यन्नास्ति वर्तमानेऽपि तत्तथा ॥

That which at the beginning and the end has no [real] *existence, has none either during the intervening period.* The Vedantists of S'ankara's school hold that existence is of three kinds, namely, *pāramārthika* (true), of which Brahma is the sole representative,—*vyāvahārika* (practical), to which all phenomena belong,—and *prātibhāsika* (apparent), which includes such things as a snake surmised in a rope, or nacre mistaken for silver. The second and third kind, therefore, have no real existence from the beginning to the end of their supposed existence.

Raghunātha says regarding it:—"नन्वादावन्ते च यन्नास्ति वर्तमानेऽपि तत्तथेति न्यायाद्धे तुच्छमेव द्वैतं मन्यन्ते तेषां ब्रह्मबोधेन सविकल्पविद्याबाधो न स्यात्तस्य ब्रह्मस्वरूपनित्यबोधमहिम्ना सदैव बाधितत्वात्" ॥ He may have taken the nyāya, like so many others in his book, from the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* where it is found as the first line of 4. 45. 45; but its real source is Gauḍapāda's kārikās on the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad.* It occurs twice there, namely in ii. 6 and IV. 31.

आम्रसेकपितृतर्पणन्यायः ॥

Watering a mango-tree, and, at the same time, satisfying the Manes with a libation. Bringing about two results by one operation. Its earliest occurrence is in the *Mahābhāṣya,* where it appears twice. In 1. 1. 1 (page 14) it stands thus:—"कथं पुनरेकेन यत्नेनोभयं लभ्यम् । लभ्यमित्याह । कथम् । द्विगता अपि हेतवो भवन्ति । तद्यथा । आम्राश्च सिक्ताः पितरश्च प्रीणिता इति" ॥ The second instance is in 8. 2. 3.

The nyāya in its consolidated form is found in the following passage of the *Nyāyamanjarī* (5. 1. 39), page 634. "तदेवमनेन चतुर्विंशतिजात्युदाहरणप्रतिसमाधानोपदेशवर्त्मना शब्दानित्यत्वसाधने परकीयमुपालम्भजातमेवंप्रायमखिलमपाकृतमाम्रसेकपितृतर्पणन्यायेन भवति भगवता सूत्रकारेण" ॥ It is not in any of the dictionaries or lists of nyāyas.

2

आम्रान्पृष्टः कोविदारानाचष्टे ॥

Questioned as to mango trees, he speaks of Kovidāra trees. This is nyāya 223 of the second part of Raghunāthavarman's large work, the *Laukikanyāyaratnākara*, and is applied by him as follows (page 419*a* of India office MS. 582):—"तथा हि लोके प्रकृष्टप्रकाशश्चन्द्र इत्यत्र प्रकृष्टपदेनाप्रकृष्टखद्योतादेः प्रकाशपदेनाप्रकाशात्मकान्धकारादेश्च व्यवच्छेदेन जिज्ञासितश्चन्द्रप्रातिपदिकमात्रार्थः प्रतिपाद्यते। इतरथा आम्रान्पृष्टः कोविदारानाचष्ट इति न्यायेन वक्तुरजिज्ञासितमर्थं प्रतिपादयतोऽश्रद्धेयवचनत्वप्रसङ्गात्" ॥ It is found in *Bhāmatī* 1. 1. 22 (page 145):—"यद्यप्याकाशपदं प्रधानार्थं तथापि यत्पृष्टं तदेव प्रतिवक्तव्यम्। न खल्वनुन्मत्त आम्रान्पृष्टः कोविदारानाचष्टे" ॥ In *Vedāntakalpataru* 1. 4. 1 (page 201):—"जीवे पृष्टे तं दुर्दर्शमिति तद्यतिरिक्तपरमात्मप्रतिवचनमाम्रप्रश्ने कोविदारप्रतिवचनवदसङ्गतम्" ॥ There is also an excellent example in the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā*, page 187, line 16, and another on page 545 of the comment on *Tattvamuktākalāpa*. Its source, however, is *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 2. 45 (vart. 8):—"अन्यद्भवान्पृष्टोऽन्यदाचष्टे। आम्रान्पृष्टः कोविदारानाचष्टे."

आयुर्घृतम् ॥

Butter is life. This scarcely deserves a place amongst maxims, but I follow Raghunātha in admitting it. It is one of the stock illustrations of writers on Alankāra, and is found in Namisādhu's comment on Rudraṭa's *Kāvyālankāra* vii. 83, as follows:—

आयुर्घृतं नदी पुण्यं भयं चौरः सुखं प्रिया।
वैरं द्यूतं गुरुर्ज्ञानं श्रेयो ब्राह्मणपूजनम् ॥

I have traced it, however, as far back as *Tait.-Sa^m^hitā* 2. 3. 2. 2, and have met with it again in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 59 (vārt. 6), and 6. 1. 32 (vārt. 6). For the last passage see "दधित्रपुसं प्रत्यक्षो ज्वरः" in the *Third Handful*. Sures'vara too furnishes an excellent example of it in his large *vārtika* 1. 5. 1848:—"परीक्ष्य चक्षुषा यस्माल्लभते गोधनादिकम्। चक्षुः स्यान्मानुषं वित्तं यथायुर्घृतमुच्यते" ॥

आशामोदकतृप्तन्यायः ॥

The illustration of *one who is satisfied with sweetmeats in prospect.* It is found in a verse quoted in *Nyāyakandalī*, page 130:—

"आशामोदकतृप्ता ये ये चोपार्जितमोदकाः ।
रसवीर्यविपाकादि तुल्यं तेषां प्रसज्यते" ॥

The same verse is quoted on page 37 of *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍa-khādya*, and is translated by Prof. Gangānātha Jhā (in the new periodical, *Indian Thought*) as follows:—"But, says an objector, from your theory it would follow that *those who enjoy merely imaginary sweets*, and those who eat real sweets, would have exactly the same experiences of flavour, strength, nutritive effects, and so on. He, we reply, who flatters himself with the hope of this objection invalidating our view, truly himself *feeds upon imaginary sweets* (इत्यस्यापि बाधकत्वमाशामोदकायते)." In *Nyāyadīpāvali*, p. 7, we read "आशामोदकोपार्जितमोदकयोरस्त्येव स्वप्नेऽपि कियद्वैलक्षण्यम्."

इषुकारन्यायः ॥

The illustration of *the arrow-maker.* Used of one wholly engrossed in his work, and unconscious of his surroundings. It is based on the following verse of *S'āntiparva*, chapter 178:— "इषुकारो नरः कश्चिदिषावासक्तमानसः । समीपेनापि गच्छन्तं राजानं नावबुद्धवान्" ॥ S'ankara makes use of it in his exposition of *Vedānta-sūtra* 3. 2. 10 ["मुग्धेऽर्धसंपत्तिः परिशेषात्." In the case of one in a swoon (there is not entrance into either of the states of sleep &c.), so, by the only remaining alternative, there is a semi-entrance (into sound sleep and another state)]. He says:— इषुकारन्यायेन मुग्धो भविष्यति । यथेषुकारो जाग्रदपीष्वासक्तमनस्तया नान्यान्विषयानीक्षत एवं मुग्धो मुसलसंघातादिजनितदुःखानुभवव्यग्रमनस्तया जाग्रदपि नान्यान्विषयानीक्षत इति । न । अचेतयमानत्वात्" ॥ Ānandagiri

refers to the same nyāya in his comment on Sures'vara's large *Vārtika* 1. 5. 106 (page 816). See, too, *Nyāyamakaranda-ṭīkā*, page 78. Compare with this the picture drawn by John Bunyan of "a man who could look no way but downwards, with a muck-rake in his hand. There stooda lso one over his head with a celestial crown in his hand, and proffered him that crown for his muck-rake; but the man did neither look up nor regard, but raked to himself the straws, the small sticks, and the dust of the floor".

इषुवेगक्षयन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the gradual diminution of the speed of an arrow.* It is found in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 3. 3. 32:— "प्रवृत्त-फलस्य कर्माशयस्य मुक्तेषोरिव वेगक्षयान्निवृत्तिः" ॥ Then, in *Bṛihadā-raṇyavārtika* 1. 4. 1529 (page 736) we read as follows:— "आरब्धफलशेषैकहेतुत्वाद्देहसंस्थितेः । रागादिप्रत्ययोद्भूतिरिषुचक्रादिवेगवत्" ॥ "The experience of passion and other mental conditions, owing to the continuance of the body caused by the remnant of fructescent works, is like the [diminishing] speed of a [potter's] wheel or of an arrow." Upon which Ānandagiri remarks:— "इषुचक्रेति ॥ यथा प्रवृत्तवेगस्येष्वादेर्वेगक्षयादेव क्षयस्तथारब्धक्षयो भोगादेव । 'भोगेन त्वितरे क्षपयित्वा संपद्यत' इति न्यायान्न ज्ञानादित्यर्थः" ॥ The quotation is *Vedāntasūtra* 4. 1. 19. In S'ankara's most interesting exposition of sūtra 4. 1. 15, we meet with the expression कुलालचक्रवत् in the same connection.

उत्कृष्टदृष्टिर्निकृष्टेऽध्यसितव्या ॥

The idea of something higher is to be superimposed upon something lower. This is Dr. Thibaut's rendering of the nyāya as it occurs in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 4. 1. 5 (the sūtra being ब्रह्मदृष्टिरुत्कर्षात्):—"एवं प्राप्ते ब्रूमः । ब्रह्मदृष्टिरेवादित्यादिषु स्यादिति ।

कस्मात् । उत्कर्षात् । एवमुत्कर्षेणादित्यादयो दृष्टा भवन्ति । उत्कृष्टदृष्टेस्तेष्वध्यासात् । तथा च लौकिको न्यायोऽनुमतो भवति । उत्कृष्टदृष्टिर्हि निकृष्टेऽध्यसितव्येति लौकिको न्यायः । यथा राजदृष्टिः क्षत्तरि " ॥ "To this we make the following reply. The contemplation on Brahman is exclusively to be superimposed on Āditya and so on. Why? 'On account of exaltation.' For thus Āditya and so on are viewed in an exalted way, the contemplation of something higher than they being superimposed on them. Thereby we also comply with a secular rule, namely the one enjoining that the idea of something higher is to be superimposed upon something lower, as when we view—and speak of—the king's charioteer as a king." Vācaspatimis'ra, in his comment on the above in the *Bhāmatī*, changes the form of the expression to "निकृष्टदृष्टिर्नोत्कृष्ट इति लौकिको न्यायः," and perhaps Rāmānuja had this in mind when, in his very short comment on the sūtra, he wrote "उत्कृष्टे हि राजनि भृत्यदृष्टिः प्रत्यवायकरी, भृत्ये तु राजदृष्टिरभ्युदयाय."

उत्खातदंष्ट्रोरगन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the snake whose fangs have been extracted.* The illustration is used by Sures'vara in his vārtika on *Bṛihadāraṇyakopanishadbhāshya* 1. 4. 1746 (page 776):—"उत्खातदंष्ट्रोरगवदविद्या किं करिष्यति । विद्यमानापि विध्वस्ततीव्रानर्थपरम्परा"॥

उपजीव्यविरोधस्यायुक्तत्वम् ॥

It is wrong to quarrel with that on which one's livelihood depends. It is found in *Paribhāshendus'ekhara* 85, as follows:—"संनिपातो द्वयोः संबन्धस्तन्निमित्तो विधिस्तं संनिपातं यो विहन्ति तस्यानिमित्तम् ॥ उपजीव्यविरोधस्यायुक्तत्वमिति न्यायमूलैषा " ॥ Professor Kielhorn has rendered it thus:—"सन्निपात 'a combination' is the junction of two (things; that which is taught in) a rule (the application of) which is caused by such (a combination), does not

cause (the application of) another (rule) which would destroy that combination. This (Paribhāshā) is founded on the maxim that *one must not be hostile to that to which one owes one's existence.*"

There are references to the nyāya in the following works:—*Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya*, page 128; *Vedāntakalpataru*, pages 231, and 556 (especially the latter); *Parimala*, pages 10, 11, 12, 451; *Nyāyamakarandaṭīkā*, page 149.

उष्ट्रलगुडन्यायः ॥

The illustration of *the camel and the stick.* The equivalent, apparently, of "Hoist with his own petard" (*Hamlet*, Act iii, Scene iv). The following is Raghunātha's exposition of it:—"स्वमते परेणोद्भाव्यमानानां दूषणानां तन्मते पातने उष्ट्रलगुडन्यायावतारः । यथोष्ट्रेणोह्यमानेनैव लगुडेन तत्प्रहारः क्रियते तथा तार्किकोत्थापितदूषणैस्तन्मतमेव वेदान्तिभिर्निराक्रियते। तथाहि। अद्वैतवादे यन्द्भोगसांकर्यादिरूपं दूषणं तैरुच्यते तदौपनिषदैर्विभ्वनेकात्मवादिनां तेषामेव मते पात्यते" ॥ It occurs in the following passage of the *Ātmatattvaviveka* (page 54, line 16):—"तज्जातीयस्य तु बाह्यवद्विज्ञानस्यापि विवेचनमेवेति स्वसंवेदनबाधितोऽयं विरुद्धधर्माध्यासो न भेदसाधक इत्युष्ट्रलगुडकं संवेदनेनैवास्य साधितत्वात्" ॥ There is another instance of it in *Vedāntakalpataru*, page 118 (where it appears as the उष्ट्रलकुटन्याय), and again in *Nyāyadīpāvali* page 6, line 11.

ऊषरवृष्टिन्यायः ॥

The simile of *rain on a saline barren waste.* Its application is similar to that of अरण्यरोदन, which see above. Hemacandra has a good example of it in his *Parisiṣ'ṭaparvan* viii. 417:—

"कषायपक्षिवृक्षेषु कृतघ्नेषु दुरात्मसु ।
एतेषु निष्फलं दानमूषरेष्वम्बुवृष्टिवत्" ॥

In *Anus'āsanaparva* xc. line 4314, we read:—" यथोषरे बीजमुप्तं न रोहेन्न वा वप्ता प्राप्नुयाद्बीजभागम्। एवं श्राद्धं भुक्तमनर्हमाणैर्न चेह नामुत्र फलं ददाति " ॥

ऋजुमार्गेण सिध्यतोऽर्थस्य वक्रेण साधनायोगः ॥

No one tries to accomplish in a round-about way a thing which can be effected by direct means. This nyāya is the counterpart of अर्के चेन्मधु विन्देत &c., and is used twice by Vācaspatimis'ra in his *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā.* On page 195, we read:—" न च कार्येणैव कारणमनुमीयतां जीवच्छरीरे किं व्यतिरेकिणा ऋजुमार्गेण सिध्यन्तं को नु वक्रेण साधयेदिति वाच्यम्। कारणमात्रस्य ततः सिद्धेरित्युक्तम् " ॥ Again, on page 203:—" अन्वयव्यतिरेकिणि हेतौ सत्यपि वैधर्म्ये साधर्म्योदाहरणमेवोचितं तत्र तत्पूर्वकत्वाद्वैधर्म्यप्रतीतेः ऋजुमार्गेण सिध्यतोऽर्थस्य वक्रेण साधनायोगात् " ॥

A still older example is found in *S'ālika*, page 86:—

" ऋजुमार्गेणार्थसिद्धौ न वक्रमार्गमाश्रयेत."

See, also, *Tarkabhāṣā*, page 48, line 5.

एकाकिनी प्रतिज्ञा हि प्रतिज्ञातं न साधयेत् ॥

Bare assertion is no proof of the matter asserted. This is Professor Gough's rendering of the saying as found in the Bauddha chapter of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 10 of Jīvānanda's edn.):—" यदि कश्चित्प्रामाण्यमनुमानस्य नाङ्गीकुर्यात्तं प्रति ब्रूयादनुमानं प्रमाणं न भवतीत्येतावन्मात्रमुच्यते तत्र न किञ्चन साधनमुपन्यस्यत उपन्यस्यते वा। न प्रथमः। एकाकिनी प्रतिज्ञा हि प्रतिज्ञातं न साधयेदिति न्यायात् " ॥ The following is from the *Laukikanyāyasangraha:*—" नन्वेकाकिनी प्रतिज्ञा हि प्रतिज्ञातं न साधयेदिति न्यायेन प्रतिज्ञयार्थसिद्ध्यभावान्नाद्वैतं साधयितुं पार्यते। भेदवादिनो हि जीवेशाभेदमपि न क्षमन्तेऽन्यस्य का कथा । तद्भेदेऽपि किं मानमिति चेन्नाहमीश्वर इति प्रत्यक्षमित्यवेहि " ॥ The nyāya " नहि प्रतिज्ञामात्रेणार्थसिद्धिः" is given in Raghunātha's list as one of similar import. Compare *Nyāyavārtika*, page 345, line 11:—"न च प्रतिज्ञा प्रतिज्ञां साधयति."

एकामसिद्धिं परिहरतो द्वितीयापद्यते ॥

Whilst avoiding one kind of fallacy, another kind appears! This is explained by Raghunātha as follows:—"इयं बौद्धाधिकारे उदयनाचार्योक्तिः । यथांकुराद्यकर्तृकं शरीर्यजन्यत्वादित्यत्र शरीरीतिविशेषणेन स्वरूपासिद्धिं परिहरतो बौद्धस्य व्याप्यत्वासिद्धिरापद्यते" ॥ The work here entitled *Bauddhādhikāra* is styled *Bauddhadhikkāra* in Hall's *Index* (pp. 81, 82). It is more generally known as *Ātmatattvaviveka;* and the passage in question is found on page 108, as follows:—"अस्तु तर्हि सत्प्रतिपक्षत्वं शरीराजन्यत्वादिति चेन्न असमर्थविशेषणत्वेनासिद्धभेदस्यातुल्यबलत्वात् । असिद्धिपरिहारेण विशेषणं समर्थमिति चेन्न एकामसिद्धिं परिहरतो द्वितीयापत्तेः" ॥ The same passage is clearly referred to in *Citsukhī* I. 24 (Paṇdit, vol. v. page 110):—"क्षित्यादिकमकर्तृकं शरीर्यजन्यत्वादाकाशवदित्यादाविव व्याप्यत्वासिद्धिरिति चेन्मैवम् । तत्राकर्तृत्वे साध्ये तदेकदेशस्याजन्यत्वस्यैवोपाधितया विशिष्टस्य व्याप्यत्वासिद्धेः । उक्तं हि । एकामसिद्धिं परिहरतो द्वितीयासिद्धिरापद्यत इति" ॥ So, too, Venkaṭanātha in the comment on his *Tattvamuktākalāpa* iii. 22 (p. 289), and again in his *Nyāyasiddhānjana,* page 100. For a clear and concise definition of the three terms आश्रयासिद्ध, स्वरूपासिद्ध and व्याप्यतासिद्ध, see Āpṭe's *Practical Sanskrit Dictionary,* s. v. असिद्ध.

कटकगवोदाहरणम् ॥

The illustration of *a cow* [tied] *in an enclosure.* This occurs in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya,* page 632:—"यत्तु सत्तेवेत्युक्तं तत्कटकगवोदाहरणमनुहरति यतः सत्ताप्यमुना दूषणेनास्माभिः खण्डनीया." The commentator explains as follows:—"यथा कटके बद्धा गौर्बन्धनरज्जुमादाय विद्रवति विद्रवद्भिरश्वैः सह तथामुना खण्डनेन विद्रवता भेदेन सत्तापि विद्रविष्यतीत्यर्थः । यद्वा यथा कटके गौरपसार्यमाणापि पुनस्तथैवायाति तथा बहुशः खण्डितापि सत्ता पुनरुदाहरणत्वेनायातीत्यर्थः" ॥ I may add that the long passage beginning with the words "किं भेदज्ञानं नास्ति," on page 632, down to the words "इत्येषा दिक्" on page 637, is taken *verbatim* from Udayana's *Ātmatattvaviveka,* pages 70 to 72. It includes another, and probably the earliest, example of the use of the nyāya "चौरापराधेन माण्डव्यनिग्रहः", for which, see the first Handful of maxims.

कण्ठचामीकरन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the golden ornament on the neck.* A person is supposed to have a golden ornament round the neck and yet to be unaware of it until some one points it out; a kind of illustration greatly in vogue amongst Vedantists, who tell us that although we are already Brahma, and free, we are not aware of the fact until instructed by a competent teacher! For the translation of a passage of the *Vedāntaparibhāshā* bearing on this, see pages 130 and 131 of my *Manual of Hindu Pantheism.* The above nyāya is found at the top of page 130 of *Ātmatattvaviveka.*

कदलीफलन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the fruit of the plantain tree.* For explanation of this see अश्वतरीगर्भन्याय. Another instance of it is found in *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* iv. 14:—"बुद्धिमेवापमृद्नाति कदलीं तत्फलं यथा." See, also, *Bodhicaryāvatāra* i. 12.

करविन्यस्तबिल्वन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the woodapple on the* [open palm of the] *hand.* Said of something unmistakably clear—"as plain as a pike-staff"! It occurs in Sures'vara's large *Vārtika* 2. 1. 95:—"अतोऽनुपेतमेव त्वां करविन्यस्तबिल्ववत् । ब्रह्म विज्ञापयिष्यामि यज्ज्ञानें सर्वविद्भवेत्" ॥ Again in 2. 5. 136 of the same:—"निःशेषोपनिषत्सारस्तदेतदिति साम्प्रतम् । उक्त्याविष्क्रियते साक्षात्करविन्यस्तबिल्ववत्" ॥ A third instance is found in 4. 3. 1334, and there is another in the vārtika on the *Taittirīyopanishadbhāshya*, page 200. Of exactly the same import is the करस्थामलकन्याय, for which see the former *Vārtika* 3. 1. 14.

कर्मभूयस्त्वात्फलभूयस्त्वम् ॥

Abundance of labor produces abundance of fruit; from great pains come great gains. It occurs in the following passage of Vidyāraṇya's *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha,* page 247:—"ब्रह्मोपासनानां सर्वेषामपि यद्येकरूपं फलं तदा गुणोपचयापचयाभ्यामुपासनोपचयापचयौ व्यर्थौ स्याताम् । तथा च कर्मभूयस्त्वात्फलभूयस्त्वमिति न्यायविरोधः" ॥ Compare S'abara's "अङ्गभूयस्त्वे फलभूयस्त्वम्" in 10. 6. 62. and 11. 1. 15. It is quoted in *Parimala,* page 600.

कांस्यभोजिन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the man who eats from a brazen vessel.* Raghunātha explains it thus:—" मया नित्यं गुरुशिष्टं भोक्तव्यं कांस्यपात्रे च भोक्तव्यमिति नियमवतो विनेयस्य नियमाभङ्गाय गुरुर्नित्यं कांस्यपात्रे भुंक्त इति । यद्यप्ययं शास्त्रीयस्तथाप्येतद्व्यवहारस्य लौकिकत्वात्सुन्दोपसुन्दन्यायवल्लौकिकेषु परिगणितः " ॥

The nyāya is taken from Jaimini's sūtra 12. 2. 34, where S'abara interprets it as follows:—"कांस्यभोजिवत् । तद्यथा । शिष्यस्य कांस्यपात्रभोजित्वनियम उपाध्यायस्यानियमः । यदि तयोरेकस्मिन्पात्रे भोजनमापद्यतेऽमुख्यस्यापि शिष्यस्य धर्मो नियम्येत । मा भूद्धर्मलोप इति " ॥ The principle here laid down is that of some one's doing something which he is *not* bound to do, in order that he may not hinder another who *is* required to do it. The converse, that is, of a man's *abstaining* from doing something, possibly harmless in his case, lest another should do the same and suffer harm. "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend."

Examples of the nyāya are found in *Tantravārtika,* pages 393, 577, and 907; in *Vidhirasāyana,* page 50; in *Bhāmatī,* page 478; in *Vedāntakalpataru,* pages 314, 425, 502, 517; and in *Parimala,* pages 462, 572, 666.

काकोलूकनिशावत् ॥

The simile of *the crow's and owl's night-time.* What is day to the former is night to the latter, and *vice versā.* This characteristic of the owl is often referred to by the poets, as, for instance, in Bhartṛihari's *Nītis'ataka* 93:—

"पत्रं नैव यदा करीरविटपे दोषो वसन्तस्य किं
नोलूकोऽप्यवलोकते यदि दिवा सूर्यस्य किं दूषणम्"।

The nyāya is found is Sures'vara's large vārtika 1. 4. 313:—

"काकोलूकनिशेवायं संसारोऽज्ञात्मवेदिनोः।
या निशा सर्वभूतानामित्यवोचत्स्वयं हरिः" ॥

Ānandagiri comments on this as follows:—"काकेति। या काकादीनां प्रसिद्धा निशा तस्यामुलूको जागर्तीति तद्दृष्ट्या सापलप्यते। यदा च काकादयो जाग्रति तदा नक्तंदृशो निशेति काकादिदृष्ट्या सापह्नूयते यथेत्यर्थः। एवमज्ञस्यायं मात्रादिः संसारो यदा विवर्तते तदा तद्दृष्ट्या तत्त्वस्यासत्कल्पना। यदा विदुषस्तत्त्वानुभवस्तदा तद्दृष्ट्या मात्रादेरसत्त्वमिति" ॥ The quotation in the second line of Sures'vara's verse is from *Gītā* ii-69 which reads thus:—"या निशा सर्वभूतानां तस्यां जागर्ति संयमी। यस्यां जाग्रति भूतानि सा निशा पश्यतो मुनेः" ॥ In *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* iii. 111 the nyāya is quoted as उलूकनिशावत्. The passage stands thus:—"अनुदितानस्तमितकूटस्थबोधमात्रस्वाभाव्यादात्मनो दुःसम्भाव्योऽविद्यासद्भाव इति चेन्न। अविद्याप्रसिद्ध्यैव तत्सद्भावसिद्धेरुलूकनिशावदित्यत इदमुच्यते।

अहो धाष्ट्र्यमविद्याया न कश्चिदतिवर्तते।
प्रमाणं वस्त्वनादृत्य परमात्मेव तिष्ठति" ॥

कारणगुणप्रक्रमन्यायः ॥

The principle *of the reproduction, in the effect, of certain qualities, in the proportion in which they exist in the produc-*

ing cause. In the *Vedāntasāra*, section 12, we read:—"तदानीं सत्त्वरजस्तमांसि कारणगुणप्रक्रमेण तेष्वाकाशादिषूत्पद्यन्ते" ॥ On which, the commentator Nṛisimhasarasvati remarks:—"तदानीमुत्पत्तिवेलायां सत्वादयस्त्रयोऽपि गुणास्तारतम्येन कारणगुणप्रक्रमन्यायेन तेष्वाकाशादिषु पञ्च-भूतेषूत्तरोत्तराधिक्येन जायन्त इत्यर्थः" ॥ For full notes on कारणगुण, see page 176 of the *Vedāntasāra* referred to above.

कार्पासरक्ततादृष्टान्तः ॥

The illustration of *the redness of cotton* [produced by smearing the cotton-seeds with red lac]. One of the stock illustrations of the Buddhist when seeking to establish the doctrine that *all existence is momentary* (क्षणभङ्गवाद). For the examination and refutation of the tenet, see S'ankara on *Brahmasūtras* 2. 1. 18, 2. 2. 20 &c.; and the opening part of the Ārhata chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha.* The nyāya is contained in the following verse:—

"यस्मिन्नेव हि सन्तान आहिता कर्मवासना ।
फलं तत्रैव बध्नाति कार्पासे रक्तता यथा" ॥

This is quoted in *Syādvādamanjarī*, pages 155 and 193; in Maṇibhadra's comment on kārikā 5 of *Ṣaḍdars'ana-samuccaya;* in a slightly altered form, on page 1501 of *Bṛihadāraṇyakavārtika;* in *Nyāyamanjarī*, page 443; in the vṛitti on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* i. 29; and in the Ārhata section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha*, where Professor Cowell renders it:—"In whatever series of successive states the original impression of the action was produced, there verily accrues the result, just like the redness produced in cotton". We find the कार्पासरागसंक्रान्तिदृष्टान्त in *Nyāyamanjarī* page 465, in the concluding portion of the author's क्षणभङ्गनिरास, and the following extract from the *Ātmatattvaviveka* (page 102) explains the process:—"यथा क्षीरावसेकादम्लत्वं परिहृत्य माधुर्यमुपादायानुवर्तमानामलकी

कालान्तरेऽपि माधुर्यमुन्मीलयति, लाक्षारसावसेकाद्वा धवलिमानमपहाय रक्ततामुपादायानुवर्तमानं कार्पासबीजं कुसुमेषु रक्तताम्." In the closing verses of the निरालम्बनवाद (*S'lokavārtika*, page 267) Kumārila deals with this Buddhist illustration in connection with a citron (बीजपूर) instead of the cotton plant; and we meet with it again in *Bhāmatī* 1. 1. 4 (page 95).

किमार्द्रकवणिजो वहित्रचिन्तया ॥

What has a seller of ginger to do with ships? Possibly the equivalent of "No cobbler beyond his last." It occurs in the following passage of *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 62, line 10:—अविद्यैव हि तथा तथा विवर्तते यथा यथानुभाव्यतया व्यवह्रियते तत्तन्मायोपनीतोपाधिभेदाच्चानुभूतिरपि भिन्नेव व्यवहारपथमवतरति गगनमिव स्वप्नदृष्टघटकटाहकोटरकुटीकोटिभिः । तदास्तां तावत् । किमार्द्रकवणिजो वहित्रचिन्तयेति ॥

कुठारच्छेद्यतां कुर्यान्नखच्छेद्यं न पण्डितः ॥

A wise man should not imagine that he can remove with a finger-nail that which can only be cut down with an axe. A caution against under-rating the strength of an enemy. It occurs in *Upamitibhavaprapancā Kathā*, page 1044:—

"नोपेक्षणीयं देवेन तस्मादेतत्प्रयोजनम् ।
कुठारच्छेद्यतां कुर्यान्नखच्छेद्यं न पण्डितः" ॥

Compare Udayana's saying in *Kiraṇāvali*, page 74:—"न खलु नखरञ्जनिका परशुच्छेद्यं छिनत्ति."

कुड्यं विना चित्रकर्मेव ॥

Like a decoration without a wall [to be decorated; or, like a

painting without a canvas]. An unreality, like a hare's horn &c. It is found in the *Nyāyamanjarī*, page 103, in a disquisition on योगिप्रत्यक्षसाधनम्.

"प्रसङ्गसाधनं नाम नास्त्येव परमार्थतः ।
तद्धि कुड्यं विना तत्र चित्रकर्मेव लक्ष्यते ॥
नहि नभःकुसुमस्य सौरभासौरभविचारो युक्तः" ॥

A much older example is contained in *Sānkhyakārikā* 41:—"चित्रं यथाश्रयमृते स्थाण्वादिभ्यो विना यथा छाया । तद्वद्विना विशेषैर्न तिष्ठति निराश्रयं लिङ्गम्" ॥

There is a similar thought in Aniruddha's comment on *Sānkhyasūtra* iii. 12. He says:—"यद्यात्मना विना देहेऽहमिति प्रत्ययस्तदा मृतदेहेऽहमिति प्रत्ययः स्यात् । न चैवम् । यथावरकेण विना न छाया भित्तिं विना न चित्रं तथात्रापि" ॥ See also Mallinātha on *Tārkikarakṣā*, page 111 and 176.

क्षीरनीरन्यायः ॥

The simile of *milk and water*. Used to illustrate the most intimate union of two or more things. The oldest example of it known to me is in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 2. 32:—क्षीरोदके सम्पृक्त आमिश्रीभूतत्वान्न ज्ञायते कियत्क्षीरं कियदुदकं कस्मिन्नवकाशे क्षीरं कस्मिन्नवकाश उदकमिति." Writers on Alankāra employ it to exemplify the figure called *Sankara* (Commixture), in which there is a combination of other figures. It differs from *Saṁsrishṭi* (Collocation) which is compared to the union between rice and sesamum, which is less intimate and easily distinguishable. The author of the *Alankārasarvasva* (page 192) says:—"अधुनैषां सर्वेषामलंकाराणां संश्लेषसमुत्थापितमलंकारद्वयमुच्यते । तत्र संश्लेषः संयोगन्यायेन समवायन्यायेन च द्विविधः । संयोगन्यायो यत्र भेदस्योत्कटतया स्थितिः । समवायन्यायो यत्र तस्यैवानुत्कटत्वेनावस्थानम् । तत्रोत्कटत्वेन स्थितौ तिलतण्डुलन्याय इतरत्र तु क्षीरनीरसादृश्यम् । क्रमेणैतदुच्यते । एषां तिलतण्डुलन्यायेन मिश्रत्वं संसृष्टिः ।......क्षीरनीरन्यायेन तु संकरः" ॥

Similarly too in *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* (page 262):—

"संसृष्टिरिति विज्ञेया सर्वालंकारसंकरः ।
सा तु व्यक्ता तथाव्यक्ता व्यक्ताव्यक्तेति च त्रिधा ॥
तिलतण्डुवद्व्यक्ता छायादर्शवदेव च ।
अव्यक्ता क्षीरजलवत्पांशुपानीयवच्च सा ॥
व्यक्ताव्यक्ता च संसृष्टिर्नरसिंहवदिष्यते ।
चित्रवर्णवदन्यास्मिन्नानालंकारसंकरे " ॥

It will be noticed that here there is mention of a third kind of combination which is likened to that of man and lion. The three kinds are noticed in *Kuvalayānanda*, also (page 337), as follows:—" अथैतेषामलङ्काराणां यथासंभवं क्वचिन्मेलने लौकिकालंकाराणां मेलन इव चारुत्वातिशयोपलंभान्नरसिंहन्यायेन पृथगलंकारावस्थितौ तन्निर्णयः क्रियते । तत्र तिलतण्डुलन्यायेन स्फुटावगम्यभेदालंकारमेलने संसृष्टिः । नीरक्षीरन्यायेनास्फुटभेदालंकारमेलने संकरः " ॥

खले कपोतन्यायः ॥

The simile of *pigeons alighting on a threshing-floor.* Used by writers on Alankāra to illustrate the production of a certain effect by the simultaneous action of numerous causes. In *Sāhityadarpaṇa* (739) we read:—" समुच्चयोऽयमेकस्मिन्सति कार्यस्य साधके । खले कपोतिकान्यायात्तत्करः स्यात्परोऽपि चेत् " ॥ "The conjunction is when notwithstanding the existence of one cause sufficient to bring about an effect, there are represented others producing the same, according to the maxim of the Threshing-floor and the pigeons." See this, also, very concisely put, in *Alankārasarvasva*, page 161, and in *Kuvalayānanda*, p. 240. There is further reference to this nyāya in Mallinātha on Māgha x. 16, and in *Nyāyamālāvistara* 11. 1. 3.

गन्धाश्मरजसा स्पृष्टो नष्टो दीपः पुनर्ज्वलेत् ॥

A lamp which has gone out will burn up again if touched with sulphur-powder. The use of this illustration will be seen from the following passage of the vṛitti on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii. 65:—"ननु संसृत्यवस्थासिद्धं निरयाणां प्रातिकूल्यं स्वानुभूतं च दुःखं मुक्तः पश्यति वा न वा । आद्ये गन्धाश्मरजसा स्पृष्टो नष्टो दीपः पुनर्ज्वलेदिति न्यायेन पुनरपि दुःखसन्ततिरुदियात्" ॥

गर्तवर्तिगोधामांसविभजनन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the partition of the flesh of an Iguana whilst it is still in its hole!* Used to illustrate an impossibility. Raghunātha says of it:—"अनवबुद्धार्थे प्रवृत्तिर्बिलवर्तिगोधाविभजनन्याये-नाशक्येति ध्वनितम्." It occurs, in the form given above, in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya* page 640:—"यदपि तथापि क इत्यादि तिर्यक् चेत्यन्तं तदपि गर्तवर्तिगोधामांसविभजनन्यायमनुहरति पक्षत्रयस्याप्युक्तयुक्त्या आच्छादितस्य दर्शयितुमशक्यत्वेन तद्विभागव्यवस्थितेरनवसरनिरस्तत्वात्" ॥

गले पादुकान्यायः ॥

The simile of *the shoes on the neck.* This quaint nyāya appears to be used when an opponent is compelled to accept certain conclusions or else adopt an utterly absurd alternative. It occurs three times in *Citsukhī.* The first instance is in i. 11 (Paṇdit, vol. IV, page 484), as follows:—सर्वेषामपि भावानामाश्रयत्वेन संमते । प्रतियोगित्वमत्यन्ताभावं प्रति मृषात्मता ॥ ११ ॥ तथाहि पटघटादीनां भावानां स्वाश्रयत्वेनाभिमतास्तन्त्वादयो ये तन्निष्ठात्यन्ताभावप्रतियोगितैव तेषां मिथ्यात्वम् । नहि तेषामन्यत्रसत्ता संभविनी । तत्रापि चेत्सा न स्यात्तदा गले पादुकान्यायेन मृषात्वमेव पर्यवस्येत्" ॥ This verse is quoted in the second chapter of the *Vedāntaparibhāshā,* and a

translation of it, and of the comment on it, by Professor Venis will be found in the *Paṇḍit* for 1883, page 660. I subjoin that portion which contains the simile. "For the existence of these things cannot be surmised anywhere but in their substrates......, and if the existence of these things, in their substrates, cannot be surmised..., then the unreality of things is the only conclusion (forced upon us), much in the same way that a man must hang his shoes round his neck if he will not wear them on his feet." The other two examples are in i. 26, and ii. 16 (Paṇḍit, vol v, pages 112 and 435). It is found also in *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 45, in *Khaṇḍanoddhāra*, pages 7 and 124, and in *Upamitibhavaprapancā Kathā*, page 284, in the erroneous form "गले पादिका."

The explanation given by *Raghunāthavarman* differs entirely from the above, and is extremely far-fetched and unsatisfactory. He says:—"सदसतोरुत्पत्तिनिवृत्त्यसंभवेन परस्परविरोधे न प्रकारान्तरस्थितिरिति न्यायसिद्धस्य सत्त्वस्यासत्त्वस्य वानुपपत्तेर्गले पादुकान्यायेनाज्ञानकार्यस्य बाधानुपपत्त्या चाज्ञानस्यानिर्वचनीयत्वं बलात्स्वीकार्यम् । यथा कस्यचिद्गृहस्थस्य गृहेऽन्नाद्यर्थित्वछलेनागतो निषण्णश्च कश्चिद्विटस्तेन तत्त्वतो ज्ञात्वा गच्छ गच्छेति पुनःपुनरुच्यमानोऽपि यदा धौर्त्येन स्वेच्छया गमनं न स्वीकरोति तदा पादुकासहितं पदं गले निधाय नोदयित्वा च बलान्निस्सार्यते तथा प्रकृतेऽपि बोध्यम् " ॥

गृहीत्वार्थं गताश्चौराः कस्तानाच्छेत्तुमर्हति ॥

The robbers have got away with the booty; who is able to intercept them? This saying is quoted by Vācaspatimis'ra in his comment (on page 59) on *Nyāyavārtika* 1, 1. 2. " अपायोऽपि तत्त्वज्ञानान्मिथ्याज्ञानस्य स्वरूपतो वा विषयतो वा फलतो वा स्यात् । न तावत्स्वरूपतः । ...नापि विषयतः । नहि शुक्तिकाज्ञानं रजतज्ञानस्य रजतविषयतामपहर्तुमुत्सहते जातं हि तद्रजतं विषयीकृत्य । यथाहुः । गृहीत्वार्थं गताश्चौराः कस्तानाच्छेत्तुमर्हतीति " ॥ It is found also in *Khaṇḍanoddhāra*, page 119.

घटप्रदीपन्यायः ॥

The simile of *a lighted lamp inside a vessel.* Raghunātha points out that a lamp so placed illuminates only the interior of the vessel, and he applies it to one whose knowledge of Brahman is of a low order. The maxim is used very differently, however, by Ānandavardhana in his *Dhvanyāloka* iii. 33 (page 190), ts the following extract will show:—"न त्वेष वाच्यव्यंग्ययोर्न्यायः । नहि व्यंग्ये प्रतीयमाने वाच्यबुद्धिर्दूरीभवति । वाच्यावभासाविनाभावेन तस्य प्रकाशनात् । तस्माद्धटप्रदीपन्यायस्तयोः । यथैव हि प्रदीपद्वारेण घटप्रतीतावुत्पन्नायां न प्रदीपप्रकाशो निवर्तते तद्वद्व्यंग्यप्रतीतौ वाच्यावभासः" ॥ Abhinavagupta, when explaining *Dhvanyāloka* i. 12, refers to this passage in the following words:—"अत एव तृतीयोद्द्योते घटप्रदीपदृष्टान्तबलाद्व्यंग्यप्रतीतिकालेऽपि वाच्यप्रतीतिर्न विघटत इति यद्वक्ष्यति तेन सहास्य ग्रन्थस्य न विरोधः" ॥ According to these great authorities on Alankāra, therefore, the nyāya teaches that as the lamp continues to burn after it has lighted up the interior of the vessel, and is indeed essential to the continuance of that illumination, so the expressed meaning of a sentence is absolutely essential as a basis for the figurative meaning which it also conveys.

घटीयन्त्रन्यायः ॥

This has the same meaning and application as the कूपयन्त्रघटिकान्याय, for which see the first series of maxims. It occurs in Sures'vara's large *Vārtika* 4. 4. 248, and 6. 2. 155, as follows:— " अनिर्ज्ञातात्मतत्त्वः सन्कामबन्धनबन्धनः । घटीयन्त्रवदश्रान्तो बंभ्रमीत्यनिशं नरः" ॥ " घटीयन्त्रवदश्रान्ता एवमेव पुनः पुनः । परिवर्तन्ति संसारे कर्मवायुसमीरिताः" ॥ Similarly, in his vārtika on the *Taittirīyabhāshya* 2. 1. 221 (page 86):—"मृतिबीजं भवेज्जन्म जन्मबीजं तथा मृतिः । घटीयन्त्रवदश्रान्तो बंभ्रमीत्यनिशं नरः" ॥ It is found too in a third work of his, namely *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* i. 42. Also in the Jain treatise *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, page 62, as follows:—

"आपद्गतं हससि किं द्रविणान्धमूढ
लक्ष्मीः स्थिरा न भवतीति किमत्र चित्रम् ।
किं त्वं न पश्यसि घटीर्जलयन्त्रचक्रे
रिक्ता भवन्ति भरिता भरिताश्च रिक्ताः" ॥

In *Upamitibhavaprapancā Kathā*, pages 52, and 418, it appears as अरघट्टघटीयन्त्रन्याय. In *Kīrtikaumudī* vi. 43, we have the compound भ्रमद्घटीसंघटितारघट्टखाङ्कारशब्दैः. The word अरघट्ट has become राहाट in Marāthī, as in राहाटगाडगें.

चक्रभ्रमणन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the* [continued] *revolving of the potter's wheel.* Followers of both Sānkhya and Vedānta have asked why, on attaining to right knowledge, a man is not immediately liberated. Kapila's answer is contained in Sūtra iii. 82. "चक्रभ्रमणवद्धृतशरीरः" ॥ On which Aniruddha says:—"यथा दण्डापगमे संस्कारवशाच्चक्रं भ्रमति तथा विवेकिनामपि देहधारणकर्मणोऽक्षीणत्वान्न तत्क्षणान्मुक्तिः किन्तूपभोगादिना कर्मक्षयादिति ॥ तथा च श्रुतिः । दीक्षयैव नरो मुच्येत्तिष्ठेन्मुक्तोऽपि विग्रहे । कुलालचक्रमध्यस्थो विच्छिन्नोऽपि भ्रमेद्घटः" ॥ *Brahmasūtrabhāshya* 4. 1. 15 teaches the same thing from the Vedāntist's standpoint, and propounds the very important doctrine that whilst accumulated and current works are destroyed by true knowledge, fructescent works, which brought about the present existence, are not. Therefore the Jīvanmukta has to continue here until death—just as the potter's wheel continues to revolve until the impetus given to it exhausts itself.

चिन्तामणिं परित्यज्य काचमणिग्रहणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *giving up the fabulous gem Cintāmaṇi, and taking instead a mere piece of quartz!* Its application is

obvious. Raghunātha applies it to the man who abandons the search for the knowledge of Brahma in order to enjoy the pleasures of this life. *S'āntis'ataka* 12, in Haeberlin's Anthology, bears on this:—"जन्मेदं वन्ध्यतां नीतं भवभोगोपलिप्सया । काचमूल्येन विक्रीतो हन्त चिन्तामणिर्मया" ॥ So, too, *Hitopades'a* ii. 60:—"मणिर्लुठति पादेषु काचः शिरसि धार्यते । यथैवास्तु तथैवास्तु काचः काचो मणिर्मणिः" ॥

There is an additional example in *Upamitibhavaprapancā Kathā*, page 420:—"निर्वाणसुखसंसारसुखयोश्च परस्परम् । चिन्तारत्नस्य काचेन यावत्तावद्गुणान्तरम्." Then, lower down on the same page, this and eight other figures are employed to illustrate the folly of one who, though acquainted with the Jaina creed, still clings to evil. The whole passage is reproduced for the benefit of those who have not the book to refer to. "यो जैनमपि सम्प्राप्य शासनं कर्मनाशनम् । हिंसाक्रोधादिपापेषु रज्यते मूढमानसः ॥ संहारयति काचेन चिन्तामणिमनुत्तमम् । करोत्यङ्गारवाणिज्यं दग्धा गोशीर्षचन्दनम् ॥ भिनत्ति नावं मूढात्मा लोहार्थं स महोदधौ । सूत्रार्थं दारयत्युच्चैर्वैडूर्यं रत्नमुत्तमम् ॥ प्रदीपयति कीलार्थं देवद्रोणीं महत्तमाम् । रत्नस्थाल्यां पचत्याम्लखलकं मोहदोषतः ॥ सौवर्णलाङ्गलाग्रेण लिखित्वा वसुधां तथा । अर्कबीजं वपत्येष तूलार्थं मूढमानसः ॥ छित्त्वा कर्पूरखण्डानि कोद्रवाणां समन्ततः । वृतिं विधत्ते मूढोऽयमहं सश्रुतिकः किल" ॥ On page 170 there is yet another word of Siddharṣi's in regard to the *Cintāmaṇi*, namely "निर्लक्षणनरो नैव चिन्तामणिमवाप्नुते."

चेतनस्य यत्नहीनस्योर्ध्वगतिश्चेतनान्तराधीना ॥

Movement upward on the part of a quiescent intelligent being is dependent on [the action of] *some other being of intelligence.* I should call this an axiom rather than a maxim; but as Ānandagiri terms it a *laukika-nyāya* I include it here. It occurs in his comment on *Brahmasūtrabhāshya* 4. 3. 5, as follows:—"चेतनस्य यत्नहीनस्योर्ध्वगतिश्चेतनान्तराधीनेति लौकिकन्यायेन यत्नहीनानां गन्तॄणां गमयितारोऽर्चिरादयश्चेतनाः स्युरिति सूत्रयोजनया ब्रूते" ॥

जलकतकरेणुन्यायः ॥

The simile of *particles of the Kataka nut* [placed] *in water* [in order to clear it]. Manu refers to it in vi. 67 thus:—"फलं कतकवृक्षस्य यद्यप्यम्बुप्रसादकम् । न नामग्रहणादेव तस्य वारि प्रसीदति" ॥ In the *Laukikanyāyasangraha* the nyāya is explained as follows:—"यथा हि सपङ्कजले निक्षिप्ताः कतकस्यौषधिविशेषस्य रेणवो रजांसि तस्माज्जलात्पङ्कं विलाप्य स्वयमेव विलीयन्ते तथा तत्त्वज्ञानं सविलासाज्ञानं निवर्त्य स्वयमेव निवर्तते" ॥ The larger work, the *Laukikanyāyaratnākara*, adds the following quotation in support of the definition:—"तदुक्तं भगवत्पादैः । अज्ञानकलुषं जीवं ज्ञानाभ्यासाद्विनिर्मलम् । कृत्वा ज्ञानं स्वयं नश्येज्जलं कतकरेणुवत् ॥" The "worshipful feet" are those of S'ankarāchārya, and the verse is *Ātmabodha* 5.

Sures'vara has given a capital illustration of the application of this in his large *Vārtika* 4. 3. 975-6 (page 1553):—

"अपां कतकसंपर्काद्यथात्यन्तप्रसन्नता ।
अपास्ताशेषसंसारभावनस्यैवमात्मनः ॥
स्वास्थ्यं प्रसन्नतैतस्मिन्सुषुप्ते भवतीत्यतः ।
सम्प्रसादमिमं प्राहुः सुषुप्तं तद्विदो जनाः" ॥

There is an interesting example, too, in Hemachandra's *Paris'iṣṭaparvan* ii. 4:—

"गुरुवाक्तकक्षोदसंसक्तमभवत्सदा ।
प्रशान्तदुर्ध्यानमलं तन्मनोवारि निर्मलम्" ॥

Venkaṭanātha, however, does not altogether hold with this simile; for in the vṛitti to his *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii. 50 (page 215), he says:—

"न तु क्वचिदपि द्रव्यनाशः । अवस्थान्तरापत्त्या चादर्शनम् । कतकरजोनिदर्शनं च बालप्रलोभनम् । न हि पयसि पंकः कतकरजसा शाम्यते विश्लेषमात्रदृष्टेः । न च स्वयं तत्र नश्यत्यसंश्लेषमात्रसिद्धेः" ॥

जामात्रर्थं श्रपितस्य सूपादेरतिथ्युपकारकत्वम् ॥

Broth cooked for the son-in-law is also useful for the unexpected guest. This, like the देहलीदीपन्याय and many others, resembles our proverb "killing two birds with one stone." I have met with it only in *Kuvalayānanda* (page 98) under the figure दीपक. The passage is as follows:—"नहि दीपस्य रथ्याप्रासादयोर्युगपदुपकारकत्वेन जामात्रर्थं श्रपितस्य सूपस्यातिथिभ्यः प्रथमपरिवेषणेन च प्रासङ्गिकत्वं हीयते &c." This passage also illustrates another of Ragunātha's nyāyas, namely गृहार्थमारोपितस्य दीपस्य रथ्योपकारकत्वम्.

ज्वरहरतक्षकचूडारत्नालंकारोपदेशवत् ॥

Like instructions for obtaining Takshaka's crest jewel as a febrifuge! An illustration of utter impossibility. It occurs in the *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*, page 3, line 9, in a passage regarding the *anubandhas*. It runs thus:—"अतस्तेषु संशयो युक्तः । अनुक्तेषु तु प्रतिपत्तृभिर्निष्प्रयोजनमभिधेयं संभाव्येतास्य प्रकरणस्य काकदन्तपरीक्षाया इव । अशक्यानुष्ठानं वा । ज्वरहरतक्षकचूडारत्नालंकारोपदेशवत् । अनभिमतं वा । मातृविवाहक्रमोपदेशवत् ॥" I am indebted to Professor C. Bendall for pointing out this passage to me. It is applied by Vācaspatimis'ra, in the same sense, in his *Tātparyaṭīkā*, page 3 and in the *Nyāyakaṇikā*, pages 338 and 417.

टिट्टिभन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the bird named Ṭiṭṭibha* [Parra Jacana]. It is based on the story of this bird as given in the *Hitopades'a*, and is used as an illustration of ridiculous conceit. The verse which paves the way for the story is ii. 137:—

"अङ्गाङ्गिभावमज्ञात्वा कथं सामर्थ्यनिर्णयः ।
पश्य टिट्टिभमात्रेण समुद्रो व्याकुलीकृतः" ॥

तक्रकौण्डिन्यन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *buttermilk for Kauṇḍinya.* This is one of Raghunātha's grammatical nyāyas, taken from Mahābhāṣya, and is intended to indicate a special exception to a general rule as in the sentence ब्राह्मणेभ्यो दधि दीयतां तक्रं कौण्डिन्याय, where an exception is made in the case of Kauṇḍinya though included amongst the Brahmans. It occurs in *Bṛihadāraṇyavārtika* 1. 6. 71 (page 881):—

"तक्रकौण्डिन्यवच्चायो न चेहाप्यवसीयते ।
उत्सर्गानवकाशत्वाच्छून्यतैवात आपतेत्" ॥

On which Ānandagiri comments as follows:—"अभिन्नशब्दस्य भेदनिषेधित्वेऽपि न भेदस्य शून्यता सर्वत्र प्राप्तस्य कारणे निषेधादार्येभ्यो दधि दीयतामित्यार्योपाधौ प्राप्तस्य दध्नस्तक्रं कौण्डिन्यायेति कौण्डिन्ये निषेधेऽप्यशून्यतावदित्याशंक्याह तक्रेति" ॥

I have noted down seven instances of the occurrence of this illustration in the *Mahābhāṣya,* namely, 1. 1. 47; 6. 1. 2 (4); 6. 2. 1; 6. 4. 163 (2); 7. 1. 72 (3); 7. 2. 117 (2); and 7. 4. 61 (4). It will suffice to quote the first, as the other six are practically the same:—"लौकिकोऽयं दृष्टान्तः । लोके हि सत्यपि संभवे बाधनं भवति । तद्यथा । दधि ब्राह्मणेभ्यो दीयतां तक्रं कौण्डिन्यायेति सत्यपि सम्भवे दधिदानस्य तक्रदानं निवर्तकं भवति." See, also, Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa's *paribhāṣā* LVII, and Professor Kielhorn's translation of the same. Other instances of it will be found in *Vākyapadīya,* ii. 352; *S'lokavārtika,* page 617 (verse 15); *Tantravārtika,* page 262 (last 2 verses); and *Bhāmati,* 3. 3. 26 (page 628).

तपनीयमपनीय वाससि ग्रन्थिकर्तारमुपहससि स्वयं च कनकमुपादाय गगनाञ्चले ग्रन्थिं करोषि ॥

Thou ridiculest the man who taking his gold ties it up in

a corner of his garment, and then thyself taking the gold tiest it up in the skirt of the sky! It is found in *Ātmatattvaviveka,* (page 58, line 3 from bottom), as follows:—"तस्मान्नीलादीनां प्रकाशमानत्वं परिपालयता ग्राह्यलक्षणे यत्नः कर्तव्यः परिहर्तव्यं वा प्रकाशमानत्वम् । अन्यथा तपनीयमपनीय वाससि ग्रन्थिकर्तारमुपहससि स्वयञ्च कनकमुपादाय गगनाञ्चले ग्रन्थिं करोषीति । सेयं सर्वप्रकारमसिद्धिः सर्वप्रकारं चानैकान्तिकमिति" ॥

तस्करकन्दुन्यायः ॥

The simile of *a thief* [who engaged himself] *as a cook.* His inability to perform the duties, however, led to his discovery and arrest. This is intended to teach the folly of undertaking to do something quite beyond our powers! Sures'vara is the only author in whose works I have met with it. The following verse, which contains it, appears in his large *Vārtika* (page 610), and also in that on the *Taittirīyopanishadbhāshya* (page 169), the preceding context, too, being identical in both cases:—"अशक्ये विनियुक्तोऽपि कृष्णलान् श्रपयेदिति । सर्वात्मनाप्यसौ कुर्वन्कुर्यात्तस्करकन्दुवत्." The following is an extract from Ānandagiri's comment on the former passage:—"तत्र यद्यपि सन्तापमात्रं कृष्णलेष्वपि शक्यं कर्तुं तथापि विक्लित्तिप्रधानः पचतेरर्थ इति न्यायेन सन्तापजन्यां तामेव तेषु कुर्वन्नायासमात्रभागी स्याद्यथा लोके तस्करः सन्कन्दुरपूपादिपक्तृषु स्वयमपि प्रविश्य तत्कर्म कुर्वन्नशक्यकारित्वादायासमात्रभाग्भवत्येवमशक्यत्वाज्ज्ञानेऽपि न वैधी प्रवृत्तिरित्यर्थः" ॥ The same commentator's explanation of the nyāya as it appears in the latter work is somewhat different. He says:—"कश्चिच्चौर्यं कृत्वा स्वकीयचौर्यसंवरणार्थं सन्निहितं कन्दुगृहं प्रविष्टः गृहस्वामिना कन्दुना कन्दुकर्मणि नियुक्तस्तत्कर्मण्यशक्ये विनियुक्तत्वात्तत्कुर्वन् राजपुरुषैस्तस्करमन्वेषमाणैस्तत्र झटिति समागतैरुक्ते कर्मण्यकुशलतां समालोच्य तस्करोऽयमिति ज्ञात्वा गृहीतो व्यर्थक्लेशभागी यथा तस्करकन्दुः संवृत्तस्तथा ब्रह्मज्ञाने नियुक्तोऽपि तस्य कर्तुमशक्यत्वात्तत्कुर्वन्व्यर्थक्लेशभागी भवेदित्यर्थः" ॥ The nyāya occurs again on page 181 of the *Taittirīyavārtika:*—"अदृश्यं पश्य इत्येवं नियुक्तोऽपि न शक्नुयात् । शक्नुयात्सन्नियोगाच्चेत्कुर्यात्तस्करकन्दुवत्" ॥

तस्करस्य पुरस्तात्कक्षे सुवर्णमुपेत्य सर्वाङ्गोद्घाटनम् ॥

A thief's offer of his limbs for examination when the gold has been found under his armpit! This occurs in the Jaimini chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 134 of Bib. Ind. edition, and page 152 of Jīvānanda's) of which the following is an extract:—"यदत्र कुसुमाञ्जलावुदयनेन झटिति प्रचुरप्रवृत्तेः प्रामाण्यनिश्चयाधीनत्वाभावमापादयता प्रण्यगादि......तदपि तस्करस्य पुरस्तात् कक्षे सुवर्णमुपेत्य सर्वाङ्गोद्घाटनमिव प्रतिभाति" ॥ Professor Cowell's rendering of the passage is as follows:—"As for the argument urged by Udayana in the Kusumānjali, when he tries to establish that immediate and vehement action does not depend on the agent's certainty as to the authoritativeness of the speech which sets him acting......all this appears to us simple bluster, like that of the thief who ostentatiously throws open all his limbs before me, when I had actually found the gold under his armpit."

तिलतण्डुलन्यायः ॥

The simile of *rice and sesamum seeds.* Used to illustrate an easily distinguishable union of two or more things, in contradistinction to the more intimate and indistinguishable union exemplified by the commingling of milk and water. For examples, see क्षीरनीरन्याय. Also Rudraṭa's *Kāvyālankārā* x. 25.

तुलोन्नमनन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the raising* [with the hand, one scale] *of a balance.* That, of course, causes the other scale to go down; and so the simile is used to illustrate the bringing about of two or more results by one operation. It occurs in the following passage of *Pancapādikā* (page 38):—"नेदं रजतमिति यत्र विपर्यासमात्रं निरस्यते न वस्तुतत्त्वमवबोध्यते तत्र तथा भवतु । इह पुनर्वि-

ज्ञानमेव तादृशमुत्पन्नं यद्विरोधिनिराकरणमन्तरेण न स्वार्थं साधयितुमलं तुलोन्नमनव्यापार इवानमननान्तरीयकः । तथाह्युन्नमनव्यापारः स्वविषयस्य तुलाद्रव्यस्योर्ध्वदेशसंबन्धं न साधयितुमलं तत्कालमेव तस्याधोदेशसंबन्धमनापाद्य । न चोन्नमनकारकस्य हस्तप्रयत्नादेरानमनेऽपि कारकत्वम्" ॥ In commenting on this, Prakās'ātman says:—"अन्यविषयव्यापारादन्यविषयस्य नान्तरीयकसिद्धिं साधयति तथाह्युन्नमनव्यापार इति" ॥

Other good examples of it will be found in *Nyāyavārtika* 3. 2. 12 (top of page 412), the substance of which is reproduced in *Nyāyamanjarī*, page 456; in *S'lokavārtikaṭīkā*, page 311 (where it is seen in conjunction with the पद्मपत्रशतव्यतिभेदन्याय); and in *Vivaraṇaprameya*, page 99, line 4.

तुषकण्डनन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the grinding of chaff*. Used, like पिष्टपेषणन्याय, of any unnecessary and useless effort. It occurs in Padmapāda's *Pancapādikā*, page 68, as follows:—"तेन पुरुषार्थरूपताऽनन्यसिद्धता तत्प्रतिपाद्यता चेति भिद्यन्ते विषयसंबन्धप्रयोजनानि तानि च त्रीण्यपि प्रवृत्त्यङ्गम् । नापुरुषार्थे काकदन्तपरीक्षायां तुषकण्डने वा प्रवर्तते प्रेक्षावान्" ॥ Also in the *Hitopades'a* iv. 13:—"अविचारयतो युक्तिकथनं तुषकण्डनम् । नीचेषूपकृतं राजन्वालुकास्विव मूत्रितम्" ॥

Sures'vara too makes very frequent use of it. We find it on pages 676, 1036, 1334, 1505, and 1572 of his large *Vārtika*; and on page 176 of his *Taittirīyavārtika*.

The nyāya is not in Raghunātha's book, but he has others of the same meaning which I have not met with in the literature; namely जलमन्थनन्याय, and गर्दभरोमगणनन्याय. The same idea is expressed in the following sentence of the *Nyāyamanjarī* (page 645):—"किमयं दग्धो दह्यते मृतो वा मार्यते अनैकान्तिकहेतूपन्यासेनैव खल्वयं तपस्वी निगृहीतोऽसाधनाङ्गवचनादिति किं हेत्वन्तराख्यनिग्रहस्थानान्तरोदीरणेनेति" ॥

तुष्यतु दुर्जनन्यायः ॥

This saying is explained by Tāranātha as follows:—"तुष्यतु दुर्जन इति न्यायो यत्र प्रतिवाद्युक्तपक्षं दुष्टमपि वादिना प्रौढिवादेनाङ्गीकृत्यापि दूषणान्तरस्य दानं तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ It would therefore seem to mean "Let this evil fellow, my opponent, chuckle over his apparent success in this argument, but what about so-and so?" I have met with it in *Advaitabrahmasiddhi*, page 14, in the following sentence:—"यथास्वरूपं किमधिकरणमुताधेयम् । यद्वा प्रतीतिकालः किं वा प्रतीतिरेव । उतावच्छेदकदेशो वेत्यत्र विनिगमनाविरहात्तुष्यतु दुर्जनन्यायेन स्वीकारेऽपि न निर्वाहः" ॥ It occurs again on page 16. In the *Bhāmatī*, page 243, we have it in the form "तुष्यतु परः" as follows:—"यद्येष परस्याग्रहो धर्मिण्यगृह्यमाणे तद्धर्मा न शक्या ग्रहीतुमिति । एवं नामास्तु तथा तुष्यतु परस्तथाप्यदोष इत्यर्थः ॥" This is decidedly the clearest example. In his translation of Haridāsa's comment on *Kusumānjali* i. 3, Prof. Cowell's rendering of the nyāya is "the principle of satisfying an opponent."

तृणजलायुकान्यायः ॥

The illustration of *the caterpillar.* This illustration is used and explained in *Bṛihadāraṇyakopanishad* 4. 4. 3 as follows:—"तद्यथा तृणजलायुका तृणस्यान्तं गत्वान्यमाक्रममाक्रम्यात्मानमुपसंहरत्येवमेवायमात्मेदं शरीरं निहत्याविद्यां गमयित्वान्यमाक्रममाक्रम्यात्मानमुपसंहरति" ॥ I include it because it is found in Raghunātha's list; but it is of no practical value.

तृणारणिमणिन्यायः ॥

The simile of *straw, araṇi wood, and the burning gem* [as means of producing fire]. The kind of fire produced by each varies (just as that of a lighted lamp differs from that of burning wood or cowdung); and the method of production, too, is

different; that being in one case blowing, in another attrition, and in the third the rays of the sun. The application of the nyāya will be seen from the following passage of *Nyāyamanjarīsāra*, page 3, line 5:—"अत्र नव्याः तृणारणिमणिन्यायेन विघ्नध्वंसविशेष एव मङ्गलस्य फलं विघ्नध्वंसविशेषान्तरं च विनायकस्तवपाठादेः फलम्। समाप्तिस्तु विघ्नसंसर्गाभावादिकारणकलापजन्या". For an interesting discussion as to the 'capacity' (शक्ति) residing in straw &c., see *Kusumānjali* pages 58–72, and Prof. Cowell's translation, pages 6 and 7. The nyāya is not included in Raghunatha's collection, but is explained in the *Vācaspatyam* (*s. v.* न्याय) as follows:—तार्णवह्निं प्रति तृणस्य, आरणेयवह्निं प्रत्यरणेः, मणिजन्यवह्निं प्रति मणेश्च कारणत्वं, न तु वह्नित्वावच्छिन्नं प्रति तृणादेः कारणत्वं परस्परव्यभिचारात्। एवं यत्र कार्यकारणभावबाहुल्यं कार्यतावच्छेदकं कारणतावच्छेदकं च नाना तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥

तैलपात्रधरन्यायः ॥

The simile of a *man carrying a vessel full of oil* [and who is to be put to death if he spills a drop of it!]. This curious illustration is given in *Bodhicaryāvatāra* vii-70, and applied to one who has adopted the ascetic life:—"तैलपात्रधरो यद्वदसिहस्तैरधिष्ठितः। स्खलिते मरणत्रासात्तत्परः स्यात्तथा व्रती."

त्यजेदेकं कुलस्यार्थे ॥

One should abandon an individual for the sake of a whole family. This is the first pāda of *Hitopades'a* i. 115 which reads thus:—"त्यजेदेकं कुलस्यार्थे ग्रामस्यार्थे कुलं त्यजेत्। ग्रामं जनपदस्यार्थे आत्मार्थे पृथिवीं त्यजेत्" ॥ It is quoted by Ānandagiri, in his comment on *Brahmasūtrabhāshya* 1. 1. 22, as follows:—"त्यजेदेकं कुलस्यार्थ इति न्यायाद्भूयसीनां ब्रह्मलिङ्गश्रुतीनामनुग्रहायाकाशश्रुतेरेकस्या बाध इत्याह" ॥ Raghunātha expounds it thus in the *Laukikanyāyasangraha*:—"यत्रोभयकोटिकसंशये एकत्र बह्वर्थहानिर्द्वितीयस्वीकारे त्वेकार्थहानिस्तत्र द्वितीयपक्षः स्वीकर्तव्य इति विवक्षायां त्यजेदेकं कुलस्यार्थ इति

न्यायः प्रसरति" ॥ Further on he says, "यस्तु त्यजेदेकमिति न्यायं नानुसरति सोऽल्पस्य हेतोर्बहु हातुमिच्छन्विचारमूढः प्रतिभासि मे त्वमिति न्यायविषयतां नातिवर्तते" ॥ A nyāya of similar import to the one under consideration is "सर्वनाशे समुत्पन्ने अर्धं त्यजति पण्डितः," which see below.

दग्धेन्धनवह्निन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the fire which has consumed the fuel* [and therefore goes out]. This immediately follows the जलकतकरेणुन्याय in Raghunātha's list, and is meant to teach much the same thing. He says:—"दग्धानीन्धनानि येन सोऽग्निर्यथा स्वयमेव शाम्यति तथेति पूर्ववत्" ॥ We have an instance of the employment of the figure in *S'vetās'vatara* Upaniṣad vi. 19; and again in S'ankara's bhāshya on *Brahmasūtra* i. i. 4 (page 76), and Sures'vara's large *Vārtika* pages 1593 and 1840. The following is *Paramārthasāra* 77:— "त्यक्त्वा कर्मविकल्पानात्मस्थं मनः केवलं कृत्वा । दग्धेन्धन इव वह्निः सर्वत्रात्मा भवेच्छान्तः" ॥

दण्डिन्यायः ॥

The simile of *a man with a stick* [or, men with sticks]. The first instance, which I know of, of the employment of this nyāya is in a curious passage of Patanjali's on Pāṇini 8. 2. 83, for reference to which I am indebted to Professor Kielhorn. It occurs also in the *Nyāyavārtika* on sūtra i. 37. In this, and in the preceding sūtra, there is a definition of *udāharaṇa*, in the course of which the term तद्धर्मभावी occurs. In regard to this the Vārtikakāra remarks:—"अन्ये तु तद्धर्मभावीत्येतत्पदमन्यथा निराकुर्वन्ति तद्धर्मभावी भवन्नुष्णभोजिन्यायेन वा भवेद्दण्डिन्यायेन वा भवेत् । तद्यदि तावदुष्णभोजिन्यायेन उष्णं भोक्तुं शीलमस्येत्युष्णभोजी तद्धर्मं वा भावयितुं शीलमस्येति तद्धर्मभावी । अत्रापि भावयितुं गमयितुं यावदुक्तं स्यादिति । नायं सूत्रार्थ इति न किञ्चिदेतत् । दण्डिन्यायस्तु दण्डो यस्यास्तीति स दण्डी तद्धर्मभावो यस्यास्ति स भवति तद्धर्मभावी" ॥

The following from Vāchaspatimis'ra's *Tattvabindu* closely resembles the explanation given of the छत्रिन्यायः—"दण्डिनो गच्छन्तीत्यत्र तु दण्ड्यदण्डिषु समूहिषु लक्ष्यमाणेषु तदन्तर्गतस्याविशेषाद्दण्डिशब्दार्थस्य परिग्रहः" ॥

दामव्यालकटन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the Asuras, *Dāma, Vyāla, and Kaṭa.* This is expounded by Raghunātha in the following manner:—"दामव्यालकटन्यायो न तव स्यात्कदाचन । भीमभासदृढन्यायः सर्वदा तेऽस्तु राघव"॥ इत्यादिना वासिष्ठ इदं न्यायद्वयं सप्रपञ्चमुपन्यस्तम् । तत्राद्यस्योच्चतरां दशामापन्नस्याप्यज्ञस्यातिनीचदशाप्राप्तिरवश्यं कालेन भवतीति तत्त्वबोधोऽवश्यं संपाद्य इति विवक्षायां प्रवृत्तिः । दामव्यालकटाख्यास्त्रयोऽसुराः शंबरेण स्वमायया निर्मितास्ते च तत्प्रहारादिना मेर्वादिचूर्णीकरणे शक्ता अप्यज्ञानप्रभावात्कालेन मशकादियोनिं प्रापुरिति प्रसिद्धं तत्र ॥ तत्त्वविन्न कदापि स्वपदात्पततीति विवक्षायां द्वितीयस्यावतारः । तेऽप्यसुरास्तेनैव तथा निर्मिताश्चिरं जीवन्मुक्तिसुखमनुभूय निर्वाणपदं प्राप्ता इति संक्षेपः । प्रपञ्चस्तु तत्रैव द्रष्टव्यः" ॥ "Vāsishṭha," means the *Yogavāsiṣṭha,* in Book 4 (chapters xxv—xxxiv) of which, we have a detailed account of these six Asuras. The verse quoted by Raghunātha is not found in the printed edition exactly in that form, but 4. 34. 36 reads thus:—

"दामव्यालकटन्यायस्तस्मान्मा तेऽस्तु राघव ।
भीमभासदृढन्यायो नित्यमस्तु तवानघ" ॥

There is one of similar import in the opening part of their history, and Mr. M. R. Telang has pointed out a third in the closing part of chapter xxiv.

धनंजयन्यायः ॥

The simile of *Arjuna.* Used to show that something, though once done, may be done again, as in the case of Arjuna who defeated the Kuru race after Krishṇa had already defeated

them. Raghunātha says:—"नित्यबोधमहिम्ना बाधितेऽपि द्वैते वाक्यजबोधस्य धनंजयन्यायेन बाधकत्वोपपत्तेः । यथाहुः । 'नित्यबोधपरिपीडितं जगद्विभ्रमं नुदति वाक्यजा मतिः । वासुदेवनिहतं धनञ्जयो हन्ति कौरवकुलं यथा पुनः' ॥" "Knowledge effected through Vedic sentences destroys that error termed the world, which had already been destroyed by eternal knowledge (Self, Brahman): just as Arjuna slays again the Kuru race already slain by Vāsudeva." The verse is *Sankshepas'ārīraka* ii. 38, and the translation is that of Mr. Arthur Venis in the *Vedāntasiddhāntamuktāvali* (page 174) where the verse is quoted.

धान्यपलालन्यायः ॥

The simile of *grain and its husk.* The earliest example of this figure is in the *Brahmabindu Upanishad,* verse 18:— "ग्रन्थमभ्यस्य मेधावी ज्ञानविज्ञानतत्त्वतः । पलालमिव धान्यार्थी त्यजेद्ग्रन्थमशेषतः" ॥ This verse, with others of similar import, is quoted in *Pancadas'ī* iv. The following, from *Bhāmatī,* page 54, appears also, without any acknowledgement, in the first chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* :—" अवर्जनीयतया दुःखमागतमपि परिहृत्य सुखमात्रं भोक्ष्यते । तद्यथा । मत्स्यार्थी सशल्कान् सकण्टकान्मत्स्यानुपादत्ते स यावदादेयं तावदादाय विनिवर्तते । यथा वा धान्यार्थी सपलालानि धान्यान्याहरति स यावदादेयं तावदुपादाय निवर्तते" ॥

Vācaspatimis'ra, however, was not the originator of the illustration. It occurs four times in the *Mahābhāṣya,* namely, 1, 2. 39; 3. 3. 18; 3. 4. 21 (vārt. 2); and 4. 1. 92. The following is the passage, the substance of which is reproduced in the *Bhāmatī* and *Sarvadars'anasangraha* :—" कश्चिदन्नार्थी शालिकलापं सपलालं सतुषमाहरति नान्तरीयकत्वात् । स यावदादेयं तावदादाय तुषपलालान्युत्सृजति । तथा कश्चिन्मांसार्थी मत्स्यान्सकण्टकान्सशकलानाहरति नान्तरीयकत्वात् । स यावदादेयं तावदादाय शकलकण्टकानुत्सृजति." See, also, Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa's *paribhāṣā* 73. The nyāya seems to have a different application in Marāṭhī literature. Molesworth's defini-

tion is as follows:—"The law of the corn and its straw. Conquer the king and you conquer his subjects; accomplish or acquire a matter and you attain all it sustains or involves."

न खलु शालग्रामे किरातशतसङ्कीर्णे प्रतिवसन्नपि ब्राह्मणः किरातो भवति ॥

A Brāhman does not become a Kirāta by living on the S'ālagrāma mountain filled with hundreds of those barbarians! This is equivalent to our saying, "A horse does not become an ass by being born in the stable of the latter." Compare, too, S'ankara's "न ह्यश्वस्थाने गां पश्यन्नश्वोऽयमित्यमूढोऽध्यवस्यति" in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1. 4. 1. The saying as given above is found in Vācaspatimis'ra's comment on *Yogabhāshya* i. 5; and he makes use of it again in his *Bhāmati* i. 1. 5 (page 126) in the sentence "अन्यथा किरातशतसंकीर्णदेशनिवासिनो ब्राह्मणायनस्यापि किरातत्वापत्तेः" ॥

न यद्गिरिश्टङ्गमारुह्य गृह्यते तदप्रत्यक्षम् ॥

A thing does not become imperceptible because perceived by one who has ascended a mountain peak.—This saying, quoted from *Tantravārtika* 1. 2. 2. (page 6), appears in the *Nyāyamanjarī* (page 422) in the course of a discussion on the *sādhutva* and *asādhutva* of words. The passage is as follows:—"ननु यदि श्रोत्रकरणकेनैव प्रत्ययेन साधुत्वासाधुत्वे प्रतिपत्तारः प्रतिपद्यन्ते व्याकरणाध्ययनवन्ध्यबुद्धयोऽपि प्रतिपद्येरन् । न च प्रतिपद्यन्ते तस्मान्न ते इन्द्रियविषये इति । नैष दोषः । वैयाकरणोपदेशसाहायकोपकृतश्रोत्रेन्द्रियग्राह्यत्वाभ्युपगमात् । यथा ब्राह्मणत्वादिजातिरुपदेशसव्यपेक्षचक्षुरिन्द्रियग्राह्यापि न प्रत्यक्षगम्यतामपोज्झति । यथाह 'न यद्गिरिश्टङ्गमारुह्य गृह्यते तदप्रत्यक्षमिति' ॥" Jayanta quotes it on pages 96 and 222, also.

नरसिंहन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the union of man and lion.* Used to illustrate a particular kind of Alankāra consisting of a combination of figures. See the quotations from *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* and *Kuvalayānanda*, under क्षीरनीरन्याय.

न हि निन्दा निन्द्यं निन्दितुं प्रयुज्यते किं तर्हि निन्दितादितरत् प्रशंसितुम् ॥

Blame is not employed in order to blame something that is blameworthy, but rather to praise something other than that. This is the form taken by the nyāya in S'abara on Jaimini 2. 4. 20. In *Tantravārtika,* page 16, it appears as "न हि निन्दा निन्द्यं निन्दितुं प्रवर्तते अपि तु विधेयं स्तोतुम्," and Ānandagiri quotes this reading of it in his comment on *Bṛihadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya* 2. 5. 16.

The following passage from *Āgamaprāmāṇya,* page 51, admirably illustrates the meaning of the nyāya:—"ननु चेदं वेदमूलत्वं पञ्चरात्रतन्त्राणामनुपपन्नं वेदनिन्दादर्शनात् । उक्तं हि चतुर्षु वेदेषु पुरुषार्थमलभमानः शाण्डिल्य इदं शास्त्रमधीतवानिति । अनवगतवचनव्यक्तेरयं पर्यनुयोगः । न हि निन्दा निन्द्यं निन्दितुं प्रवर्तते अपि तु निन्दितादितरत्प्रशंसितुम् । यथैतरेयकब्राह्मणे 'प्रातः प्रातरनृतं ते वदन्ति' इत्यनुदितहोमनिन्दा उदितहोमप्रशंसार्थेति गम्यते । यथा मानवे (iv. 124) ।

'ऋग्वेदो देवदैवत्यो यजुर्वेदस्तु मानुषः ।
सामवेदस्तु पित्र्यः स्यात्तस्मात्तस्याशुचिर्ध्वनिः' ॥

इति सामवेदनिन्दा इतरवेदप्रशंसार्था । यथा वा भारते ।

'चत्वार एकतो वेदा भारतं चैकमेकतः ।
समागतैस्तु ऋषिभिस्तुलयारोपितं पुरा ॥
महत्त्वे च गुरुत्वे च ध्रियमाणं यतोऽधिकम् ।
महत्त्वाच्च गुरुत्वाच्च महाभारतमुच्यते' ॥

इति महाभारतप्रशंसार्थेति गृह्यते न वेदनिन्देति । एवं पञ्चरात्रप्रशंसेति गम्यते" ॥

6

Another reference to the nyāya will be found in *Nyāyamanjarī* page 273.

नहि भवति तरक्षुः प्रतिपक्षो हरिणशावकस्य ॥

A hyena does not find a suitable opponent in a young fawn. This may be contrasted with the saying "न हि कठोरकण्ठीरवस्य कुरङ्गशावः प्रतिभटो भवति." It is found in the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā*, page 33:—"तुल्यबलौ हि मिथः प्रतिपक्षौ भवतो न तु दुर्बलोत्तमबलौ । न हि भवति तरक्षुः प्रतिपक्षो हरिणशावकस्य किन्तु समरकण्डूनिघ्नविषाणकोटिसमुल्लिखितगण्डशैलस्य विपिनमहिषस्य" ॥

न हि भिक्षुकाः सन्तीति स्थाल्यो नाधिश्रीयन्ते न च मृगाः सन्तीति यवा नोप्यन्ते ॥

Men do not refrain from setting the cooking-pots on the fire because there are beggars [who may come to ask for some of the contents], *nor do they abstain from sowing barley because there are wild animals* [which may devour it]. This oft-quoted saying appears three times in the *Mahābhāṣya*, namely in 1. 1. 39 (vārt. 16), 4. 1. 1 (vārt. 15), and 6. 1. 13 (vārt. 13), and this is probably the original source of it. I have met with it in two of Vācaspatimis'ra's works, as follows. In the *Nyāyavārtika tātparyaṭīkā*, page 62:—"नो खल्वयं प्रेक्षावतां समाचारो यद्दुःखभिया सुखपरित्याग इति अपि तु सुखं दुःखाद्विभियोपाददते दुःखं च वर्जयन्ति । न हि मृगाः सन्तीति शालयो नोप्यन्ते भिक्षुकाः सन्तीति स्थाल्यो नाधिश्रीयन्त इति" ॥ Similarly, on page 441 of the same. In *Bhāmatī*, page 54, we read:—"तस्माद्दुःखभयान्नानुकूलवेदनीयमैहिकं वामुष्मिकं वा सुखं परित्यक्तुमुचितम् । न हि मृगाः सन्तीति शालयो नोप्यन्ते भिक्षुकाः सन्तीति स्थाल्यो नाधिश्रीयन्ते " ॥ The same passage, with a good deal of the preceding context, reappears, without acknowledgment, in the Chārvāka chapter of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha.* We find the saying in a modified form in the *Panca-*

pādikā, page 63:—"अतोऽजीर्णभयान्नाहारपरित्यागो भिक्षुकभयान्न स्थाल्या अनधिश्रयणं दोषेषु प्रतिविधातव्यमिति न्यायः ॥" It appears in this form in *Jivanmuktiviveka*, (page 8) also, and is there ascribed to Ānandabodhācārya. See his प्रमाणमाला page 21. Then we have the well-known verse, *Hitopades'a* ii. 50:—

"दोषभीतेरनारम्भः कापुरुषस्य लक्षणम् ।
कैरजीर्णभयाद्भ्रातर्भोजनं परिहीयते ॥"

न हि श्यामाकबीजं परिकर्मसहस्रेणापि कलमाङ्कुराय कल्पते ॥

Not even by the employment of a thousand different processes can S'yāmāka grain be made to germinate as rice. Vācaspatimis'ra was fond of this kind of saying. That above is from his *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā*, page 55, and another of the same class occurs twice in the *Bhāmatī*. On page 180 (1. 2. 18) "नहि जातु वटाङ्कुरः कुटजबीजाज्जायते," and on page 704 (4. 1. 1.) "न खलु कुटजबीजाद्वटाङ्कुरो जायते" ॥ Compare, too, Manu ix. 40:—"अन्यदुप्तं जातमन्यदित्येतन्नोपपद्यते । उप्यते यद्धि यद्बीजं तत्तदेव प्ररोहति" ॥ They all remind us of those sayings from another part of the Orient:—"Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" and again, "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap."

न हि सहस्रेणाप्यन्धैः पाटच्चरेभ्यो गृहं रक्ष्यते ॥

Not even a thousand blind men can protect a house from robbers. This is another of the sayings of Vācaspatimis'ra, and is found in his ṭikā on *Nyāyavārtika* 1. 2. 2 (the definition of जल्प). To see the aptness of the saying it would be necessary to transcribe a lengthy passage of the *bhāshya* and *vārtika*; but the scholar can easily refer to them himself.

न हि सुतीक्ष्णाप्यसिधारा स्वं छेत्तुमाहितव्यापारा ॥

The edge of a sword, even though very keen, is not employed to cut itself. The nyāya is found in this form in *Syādvādamanjarī*, page 89, in combination with that which immediately follows; and Mr. Thomas, the Librarian at the India Office, tells me that he has met with the two together in Nāgārjuna's ईश्वरकर्तृत्वनिराकरण, but there the sword-nyāya takes the form of "न हि खरतरकरवालधारा स्वमात्मानं छेत्तुं समर्था भवति·" In *Madhyamakavritti*, page 62, it again occurs in conjunction with another simile:—"यथापि नाम तयैवासिधारया सैवासिधारा न शक्यते छेत्तुं न तेनैवाङ्गुल्यग्रेण तदेवाङ्गुल्यग्रं शक्यते स्प्रष्टुं &c." For the latter, see Third Handful. Further instances will be found in *Tātparyaṭīkā*, page 255; *Nyāyamakaranda*, page 131; and others of a like nature in Venkaṭanātha's *Sarvārthasiddhi*, page 391.

न हि सुशिक्षितोऽपि नटबटुः स्वस्कन्धमधिरोढुं पटुः ॥

No young actor, however well-trained, is clever enough to get on his own shoulder. This is Malliṣeṇa's version of the nyāya, as cited in conjunction with the cognate one above. In *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 3. 3. 54, S'ankara quotes it as "न हि नटः शिक्षितः सन्स्वस्कन्धमधिरोक्ष्यति·" In the vārtika on *Taittirīyabhāṣya*, page 108, Sures'vara puts it thus:—"नालं स्वस्कन्धमारोढुं निपुणोऽपीह साधकः" ॥ Other varieties are the following. "न हि सुशिक्षितोऽपि विज्ञानी स्वेन स्कन्धेनात्मानं वोढुमुत्सहते, *Bhāmatī* 1. 3. 41 (page 277); "न हि सुशिक्षितोऽपि नटबटुः स्वस्कन्धमारुह्य नृत्यति," *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya*, page 592; and, finally, "न हि पटुतरोऽपि नटबटुः स्वस्कन्धमारुह्य नरीनर्ति", *Vidyāsāgarī* on *Khaṇḍana*, page 57. It will thus be seen that no two authors agree as to the form of the maxim!

न ह्यप्राप्य प्रदीपः प्रकाश्यं प्रकाशयति ॥

A lamp does not illuminate until it [*i. e.* its light] *reaches the object to be illuminated.* It therefore comes under the head of प्राप्यकारी, for which, and its opposite, see *Nyāyakandalī*, page 23. It occurs in the *Nyāyamanjarī* on 5. 1. 7 (page 624): "सोऽयं हेतुः प्राप्य वा साध्यं साधयेदप्राप्य वा । प्राप्य चेद् द्वयोर्लब्धस्वरूपयोरप्राप्तिर्भवतीति किं कस्य साध्यं साधनं वेत्यविशेषः । अप्राप्य तु साधकत्वमनुपपन्नमतिप्रसङ्गात् । न ह्यप्राप्य प्रदीपः प्रकाश्यं प्रकाशयतीति" ॥ Also in *Tārkikarakṣā* page 271:—"न हि दाह्यमप्राप्तो दहनो दहति प्रकाश्यमप्राप्य प्रदीपः प्रकाशयति." Then in *Sarvārthasiddhi* (on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* i. 32) we read:—"अप्राप्तोत्पादने सर्वस्मात्सर्वमुत्पद्येत प्रकाश्यमप्राप्य वा दीपः प्रकाशयेद्दाह्यमप्राप्य वा दहनो दहेत्." Compare Nāgārjuna's kārikā vii. 11:—"अप्राप्यैव प्रदीपेन यदि वा निहतं तमः । इहस्थः सर्वलोकस्थं स तमो निहनिष्यति" ॥

नान्यदृष्टं स्मरत्यन्यः ॥

One person does not remember what another has seen. This is the first pāda of *Kusumānjali* i. 15, the whole verse being as follows:—

"नान्यदृष्टं स्मरत्यन्यो नैकं भूतमपक्रमात् ।
वासनासंक्रमो नास्ति न च गत्यन्तरं स्थिरे" ॥

Professor Cowell translates thus:—"One does not remember what another has seen; the body remains not one and the same from decay; there cannot be transference of impressions, and if you accept a non-momentary existence there is no other means." The kārikā, however, is hardly intelligible apart from the preceding context of which it is a sort of summing up. The nyāya did not, however, orginate with Udayana, since it is quoted in Vyāsa's *Yogabhāṣya* iii. 14, and in *Nyāyabhāṣya* 1. 1. 10. It is found, too, in *Syādvādamanjarī*, pages 61 and 154; also in *Nyāyamanjarī*, page 437, line 10.

नो खल्वन्धाः सहस्रमपि पान्थाः पन्थानं विदन्ति ॥

Not even a thousand blind travellers can discover the road [to be taken]. This is contained in *Bhāmatī* 1. 1. 5 (page 124), in the following passage:—"न हि प्राधानिकान्यन्तर्बहिष्करणानि त्रयोदश सत्त्वप्रधानान्यपि स्वयमेवाचेतनानि तद्वृत्तयश्च स्वं वा परं वा वेदितुमुत्सहन्ते । नो खल्वन्धाः सहस्रमपि पान्थाः पन्थानं विदन्ति । चक्षुष्मता चैकेन चेद्वेद्यते स एव तर्हि मार्गदर्शी स्वतन्त्रः कर्ता नेता तेषाम्" ॥

पण्डकमुद्वाह्य मुग्धायाः पुत्रप्रार्थनम् ॥

It is better to leave this untranslated. The पण्डकोपाख्यान is found in Vyāsa's *Yogabhāshya* ii. 24, as follows:—"अत्र कश्चित्पण्डकोपाख्यानेनोद्घाटयति । मुग्धया भार्ययाभिधीयते । पण्डक आर्यपुत्र अपत्यवती मे भगिनी किमर्थं नाम नाहमिति । स तामाह मृतस्तेऽहमपत्यमुत्पादयिष्यामीति" ॥ On this Vācaspatimis'ra remarks:—"अत्र कश्चिन्नास्तिकः कैवल्यं पण्डकोपाख्यानेनोपहसति" ॥ The nyāya, as given above, is found in the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā*, page 29:—"यदि हि पक्षं विहाय बहिरेव सपक्षासपक्षयोरविनाभावो गम्येत तदा बहिर्व्याप्तिमात्रबलेन पक्षधर्मोऽपि हेतुर्न पक्षे साध्यं साधयेत् । असिद्धा हि तत्र स्वसाध्येन व्याप्तिः । तदेतत्पण्डकमुद्वाह्य मुग्धायाः पुत्रप्रार्थनमिव" ॥ See, too, *Citsukhī* ii. 26 (Paṇḍit, vol. v. page 514) where reference is made to Vācaspati's use of the nyāya; and the same objection is taken to it by S'rīharsha in the *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya*, page 354.

पादप्रसारिका ॥

Professor Venis tells me that the Benares paṇḍits regard this as a shortened form of the भिक्षुपादप्रसारणन्याय (for which, see the First Handful of maxims), and that it means "unduly extending one's claim or one's position generally." Its equivalent in Marāthī is पाय पसरणें, which, Molesworth tells us, means "to establish one's self freely and fully: to extend one's power far and wide." He gives, as an example of its use, the Marāthī

proverb "भट्टास दिली ओसरी भट्ट पाय पसरी," which is the equivalent of our "Give him an inch and he'll take an ell." In the passages, however, in which I have met with the expression, it seems to imply *a dogged adherence to a position* in spite of previous failure, and when there is little prospect of future success. Two passages in *Upamitibhavaprapancā Kathā* pages 798 and 907, seem to confirm this:—"एतत्सर्वमनालोच्य कृत्वा पादप्रसारिकाम्। विवेकचक्षुः सम्मील्य स्वपन्ति ननु जन्तवः" ॥ "ततो विषादमापन्नः सर्वकर्मपराङ्मुखः। स्थितोऽहं मौनमालम्ब्य कृत्वा पादप्रसारिकाम्" ॥ There are two other instances of it on pages 656, 657 of the same, and it occurs three times in the *Nyāyamanjarī,* as follows. On page 113:—"एवं हि द्विविधं प्रतिबन्धमनुमेयाव्यभिचारनिबन्धनमनुक्त्वा केवलसाहचर्यनियममात्रवर्णनं यत्प्रसारिका सैवेति। उच्यते। पादप्रसारिकैव साधीयसी स्थूलदृष्टिभिरवलंबिता वरं न सूक्ष्मदृष्टिभिरुत्प्रेक्षितास्तादात्म्यादिप्रतिबन्धाः" ॥ On page 121:—"यं कंचिदर्थमालोक्य यः कश्चिन्नावगम्यते। कंचिदेवाक्षिपत्यर्थमर्थः कश्चिदिति स्थितिः ॥ तत्र वस्तुस्वभावोऽयमिति पादप्रसारिका। दृश्यते ह्यविनाभूतादर्थादर्थान्तरे मतिः" ॥ On page 504:—"न च न कदाचिदनीदृशं जगदिति पादप्रसारिकामात्रं कर्तुमुचितं सर्गप्रबन्धप्रलयप्रबन्धस्य समर्थितत्वादिति ॥ अतश्च पक्षान्तरदुर्बलत्वाद्यथोदितः सिध्यति भूतवर्गः। तं यस्तु पश्यन्नपि निह्नुवीत तस्मै नमः पण्डितशेखराय" ॥ There is one instance of it in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya* (page 31) also:—"न च सत्ताभेदानन्त्यमस्त्येवेत्यपि पादप्रसारिका निस्ताराय," which is rendered by Prof. Gangānātha Jhā:—"Nor will you escape from this predicament by *taking the long step* of assuming an infinity of different kinds of real existence." *Indian Thought,* page 17.

पिण्डमुत्सृज्य करं लेढि ॥

Leaving the sweet morsel he licks his hand! It is found in *Pañcapādikā,* page 49, as follows:—"अथ वेदाधिकरणे वेदांश्चैके सन्निकर्षमिति विशेषाभिधानाद्वैदिकत्वसिद्धिरिति। सोऽयमाभाणको लोके पिण्डमुत्सृज्य करं लेढीति सूत्रकारस्याप्यकौशलं प्रदर्शितं स्यात्" ॥ In Raghunātha's list it appears as पिण्डं हित्वा करं लेढि. We may compare it with the saying "क्षीरं विहायारोचकग्रस्तः सौवीररुचिमनुभवति".

पित्रनुसृतस्तनंधयन्यायः ॥

The simile of *a father's conforming to* [the ways of] *his little child.* This is set forth as a model for the knower of Brahma, that, by a lowly and humble demeanour, he may attract the ignorant. It is thus explained in the *Laukikanyāya-sangraha*:—"कृतकृत्यस्य तत्त्वविदोऽतत्त्वविदुद्धारातिरिक्तकर्तव्याभावाद्यथा तदुद्धारः स्यात्तथैव कर्तव्यम्। सुरेन्द्रादिपूज्येनापि विदुषा पित्रनुसृतस्तनंधयन्यायेनाज्ञोऽनुसर्तव्यः। तैर्निन्द्यमानोऽपि देहस्य निन्द्यत्वमात्मनोऽवाङ्मनसगम्यत्वं च जानन्नोद्विजेत्। किन्तु प्रत्युत तच्चेष्टानुसारेण स्वयमप्याचरेत्" ॥ In the larger work the following passage is quoted by way of illustration:—" तदुक्तं वृद्धैः। ...... अविद्वदनुसारेण वृत्तिर्बुद्धस्य युज्यते। स्तनंधयानुसारेण वर्तते तत्पिता यतः॥ अधिक्षिप्तस्ताडितो वा बालेन स्वपिता तदा। न क्लिश्नाति न कुप्येच्च बालं प्रत्युत लालयेत्॥ निन्दितः स्तूयमानो वा विद्वानज्ञैर्न निन्दति। न स्तौति किन्तु तेषां स्याद्यथा बोधस्तथाचरेत् " ॥ The "elder" is Vidyāraṇya, and the verses are *Pancadas'ī* VII. 286-288.

पिशाचानां पिशाचभाषयैवोत्तरं देयम् ॥

Pis'ācas should be answered in the Pis'āca language. This nyāya is found on pages 214 and 410 of *Sarvārthasiddhi* (on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii. 49 and iv. 13), in the first instance in conjunction with "यक्षानुरूपो बलिः", with which it is clearly synonymous. See "यादृशो यक्षस्तादृशो बलिः".

पुष्टलगुडन्यायः ॥

The simile of *a stout cudgel.* Such a stick, hurled at a yelping cur, may at the same time strike and silence other dogs near it; and so the nyāya seems to be used somewhat in the sense of "Killing two birds with one stone." It is thus defined by Raghunātha:—" एकताद्रिकमतनिरासाय प्रयुक्तया युक्त्या तत्सदृशमतान्तरनिराकरणं यदा विवक्ष्यते तदा पुष्टलगुडन्यायप्रवृत्तिः । यथा बहूनां शुनां मध्य एकस्य शुनः प्रहारार्थं प्रक्षिप्तः पुष्टलगुडस्तं प्रहृत्यान्यानपि प्रहरति तथा ब्रह्मकारणवादिभिः सांख्याभिमतप्रधानकारणवादनिरासाय प्रयुक्ता 'ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दं' 'रचनानुपपत्तेश्च नानुमानं' इत्यादिसमन्वयाविरोधाध्यायगतसूत्रस्था

युक्तयस्तं निरस्य योगाभिमतप्रधानकारणवादमपि साम्यान्निराकुर्वन्तीति दिक्" ॥ The simile is employed in this sense in *Advaitabrahmasiddhi*, page 100:—"न चेदं दोषत्रयं वैशेषिकेपूक्तं तदेव विज्ञानवादिषु किमर्थमापद्यत इति वाच्यम् । पुष्टलगुडन्यायेन वैशेषिकमत इव 'अन्तः सत्' इतिवादिनो 'बहिः सत्' इतिवादिनश्च बौद्धस्य मतेऽपि प्रसरतीत्यभिप्रायात्" ॥ It is akin to प्रधानमल्लनिबर्हणन्याय, which see in First Handful.

प्रदीपवत् ॥

The simile of *a lamp*. We have here another of the many lamp-illustrations. In *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 49 (vārt. 4) an *adhikāra* is said to be of three kinds, and in the first it is likened to a lamp in the following words:—"कश्चिदेकदेशस्थः सर्वं शास्त्रमभिज्वलयति यथा प्रदीपः सुप्रज्वलित एकदेशस्थः सर्वं वेश्माभिज्वलयति." In the opening part of 2. 1. 1, where the question is asked "कः पुनरधिकारपरिभाषयोर्विशेषः," the *paribhāṣā*, and not the adhikāra, is likened to a lamp, in the same words as above.

Nāges'a (in vol. iii. page 8 of the *Uddyota*) quotes the following verse:—

"एकदेशस्थिता शास्त्रभवने याति दीपताम् ।
परितो व्यापृतां भाषां परिभाषां प्रचक्षते" ॥

We find the same figure in Jaimini's sūtra 11. 1. 60, which S'abara explains thus:—"प्रदीप एकस्मिन्प्रदेशे भुञ्जानानां ब्राह्मणानामेकस्य सन्निधौ प्रज्वलितः सर्वेषामुपकारं करोति." In dealing with this adhikaraṇa Mādhava substitutes the figure of a single *dancer* amusing a number of spectators. See the नर्तकन्याय in Third Handful.

प्रसक्तं हि प्रतिषिध्यत इति न्यायः ॥

This nyāya, which is quoted by Amaradāsa in his ṭikā on *Vedāntas'ikhāmaṇi*, page 262, is apparently another form of the more concise प्रसज्यप्रतिषेध which, as it occurs in the Yoga section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha*, is rendered by Prof. Cowell

"Express negation." In a footnote (on page 250) he explains it thus:—"Where the negation is prominent it is called *prasajya-pratishedha*; but where it is not prominent we have the *paryudāsa* negation. In the former, the negative is connected with the verb: in the latter, it is generally compounded with some other word; as, for example, (a) 'Not a drum was heard, not a funeral note'. (b) 'Unwatched the garden bough shall sway'. The former corresponds to the logicians' *atyantābhāva*, the latter to *anyonyābhāva* or *bheda*".

In the Vācaspatyam the nyāya is quoted under प्रसज्यप्रतिषेध as follows:—"प्रसज्य प्रसक्तिं सम्पाद्यारोप्येति यावत्प्रतिषेधः । अत्यन्ताभावे । 'प्रसक्तं हि प्रतिषिध्यत' इति न्यायेन आरोपितप्रसंगस्यैव निषेधः । तेन वायौ रूपं नास्तीत्यादावपि वायौ रूपारोपं कृत्वैव निषेधो नञा बोध्यत इति विवेकः ॥" According to this, then, the meaning of the nyāya is "that which has been applied or asserted is subsequently withdrawn or denied."

Both the forms of negation are contained in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 4. 50 &c., in *Vākyapadīya* ii. 86, and in Sures'vara's large vārtika 3. 9. 73. Verses defining the two are quoted on page 214 (Chap. vii.) of the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, and renderings will be found on page 254 of Mr. Pramadādāsa's translation. Compare Molesworth's definitions of the terms.

फलवत्सन्निधावफलं तदङ्गम् ॥

The principle that *whatever has no result of its own, but is mentioned in connection with something else which has such a result, is subordinate to the latter.* This is Dr. Thibaut's rendering of the nyāya as it occurs in *Brahmasūtrabhāshya* 2. 1. 14 (page 443), and he explains it thus in a footnote:—"A Mīmāmsā principle. A sacrificial act, for instance, is independent when a special result is assigned to it by the sacred texts; an act which is enjoined without such a specification is merely auxiliary to another act." The source of the nyāya is

S'abara 4. 4. 19, and Mādhava applies it in *Nyāyamālāvistara* 4. 3. 16 (sūtra 37). I have met with it also in *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā*, page 178, line 2; and in *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, page 117, line 11; and page 147, line 9 from bottom.

बकबन्धनन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the capture of a crane.* Raghunāth explains it thus:—A man wishing to secure a crane puts butter on its head, which, when melted by the sun, goes into its eyes and blinds it, so that he can then take hold of it! He clearly took this explanation from the *Tattvadīpana*, a commentary on the *Pancapādikāvivaraṇa* (itself a commentary), and I subjoin a portion of each. *Vivaraṇa*, page 283, line 4:—

"ननु स्वर्गकामिनो यागकर्तव्यता स्वर्गसाधनमन्तरेणानुपपन्ना। तच्च साधनत्वं क्षणभंगिनः कर्मणो मध्यवर्तिकार्यमन्तरेणानुपपन्नमिति श्रुतार्थापत्त्याऽपूर्वं गम्यते तत्र शब्दस्य सामर्थ्यं गृह्यत इति सोऽयं बकबन्धः"॥ On this the *Dīpana*, page 779, bottom line:—" बकबन्ध इति। बकबन्धसमानन्याय इत्यर्थः। बकग्रहणे क उपाय इति केनचित्पृष्टे खरतरदिनकरसंपर्कात्तन्मस्तकनिहितनवनीतबिन्दुभिर्नयनयोः पूर्णतायां तद्ग्रहणं सुकरमिति कश्चित्तुच्छमतिः प्रतिवक्ति। न च तदुपपद्यते। बकग्रहणमन्तरेण तन्मस्तके नवनीतप्रक्षेपानुपपत्तेः। तस्मिंश्च परिगृहीते तत्प्रक्षेपोऽपि मुधा." Then follows his application of the nyāya. Both writers evidently regard it as an illustration of something ridiculous; and to me it recalls the nursery tradition that the way to catch a sparrow is to put salt on its tail! Raghunātha, however, classes it with nyāyas deprecating a roundabout way of doing a thing. Amongst these he gives the दण्डसर्पमारणन्याय, where a man whilst looking for a stick with which to kill a snake, comes upon an axe; but, instead of using that against the enemy, he goes out to cut a stick with it.

In *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, page 262, line 9, we again find the बकबन्धप्रयास.

वधिरकर्णजपन्यायः ॥

The illustration of *whispering in the ear of a deaf man.* A good example is found in *Upamitibhavaprapancā Kathā*, page 1062:—

"बधिरे कर्णजापोऽयमन्धे नृत्तप्रदर्शनम् ।
ऊषरे बीजनिक्षेपस्तस्य या धर्मदेशना" ॥

Compare the following from *Nyāyamanjarī*, page 405:— "तदेतद्बधिरस्य रामायणं वर्णितमस्माभिर्य एवमपि श्रुत्वा वेदार्थपरिगमाभ्युपायं मृगयते." Also the expression "बधिरेष्विव गायनम्" in *Naiṣkarmya-siddhi* iv. 21. For similes of a like kind, see अरण्यरोदनन्याय.

वहुच्छिद्रघटप्रदीपन्यायः ॥

The simile of *a lamp in a vessel with many holes.* Raghunātha explains it as follows:—"चक्षुरादिद्वारा बहिर्निर्गत्यैव जीवोपाधिभूता धीर्बाह्यविषयान्व्याप्नोति तद्योगाच्च चिदाभासोऽपि निःसृत इव प्रतीयत इति विवक्षायां बहुच्छिद्रघटप्रदीपन्यायोऽवतरति । अयं भगवत्पादैः संक्षेपेण भाष्यतात्पर्यप्रकाशके श्रीदक्षिणामूर्तिस्तोत्रे सोदाहरणमुक्तः । 'नानाच्छिद्रघटोदरस्थितमहादीपप्रभाभास्वरं ज्ञानं यस्य तु चक्षुरादिकरणद्वारा बहिः स्पन्दते । जानामीति तमेव भान्तमनुभात्येतत्समस्तं जगत्तस्मै श्रीगुरुमूर्तये नम इदं श्रीदक्षिणामूर्तये' इति" ॥ The above is verse 4 of S'ankara's poem, to the exposition of which Sures'vara devotes 37 verses in his *Mānasollāsa.*

भारैकदेशावतरणन्यायः ॥

The illustration of *the lowering of one part of a load* [and so easing one's burden]. This is found under *Tantravārtika* 1. 3. 22 (page 222):—"दृढविपर्ययज्ञानानन्तरं सहसैव च सम्यग्ज्ञानोत्पादातिभाराद्भारैकदेशावतरणार्थं संशयोत्थापनामात्रमेव तावद्युक्तम्." Prof. Gangānātha Jhā renders the passage thus:—"When a certain conclusion to the contrary has been laid out in an exceptionally

strong manner, if one proceeds to immediately point out the true theory, it involves a very hard work; and hence with a view to lighten this burden, the present sūtra proceeds only to weaken the contrary view by throwing it open to doubt."

Jayanta Bhaṭṭa reproduced this on page 419 of the *Nyāya-manjarī* as follows:—"पूर्वपक्षिकोक्तयुक्तिसमुत्थापितस्थिरतरविपर्ययज्ञान-समनन्तरं सहसैव सम्यग्ज्ञानोत्पादनातिभाराद्वारैकदेशावतरणन्यायेन संशय-स्तावदुपपद्यते."

भीमभासदृढन्यायः ॥

The illustration of the three Asuras, *Bhīma, Bhāsa, and Dridha*. See this explained under दामव्यालकटन्याय.

भूलिङ्गन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the bird Bhūlinga*. It is supposed to say "*mā sāhasam,*" "don't do anything desperate", and then does desperate deeds itself! The purport of the nyāya would therefore seem to be, "Practise what you preach." There are two references to this bird in *Sabhāparva*. The first is in XLI. 18 (Bombay edition):—"न गाथागाथिनं शास्ति बहु चेदपि गायति । प्रकृतिं यान्ति भूतानि भूलिङ्गशकुनिर्यथा" ॥ This is explained by the second passage (XLV. 27-32.):—"अथ चैषां न ते बुद्धिः प्रकृतिं याति भारत । मयैव कथितं पूर्वं भूलिङ्गशकुनिर्यथा ॥ २७ ॥ भूलिङ्गशकुनिर्नाम पार्श्वे हिमवतः परे । भीष्म तस्याः सदा वाचः श्रूयन्तेऽर्थविगर्हिताः ॥ २८ ॥ मा साहसमितीदं सा सततं वाशते किल । साहसं चात्मनातीव चरन्ती नावबुध्यते ॥ २९ ॥ सा हि मांसार्गलं भीष्म मुखात्सिंहस्य खादतः । दन्तान्तरविलग्नं यत्तदादत्तेऽल्पचेतना ॥ ३० ॥ इच्छतः सा हि सिंहस्य भीष्म जीवत्यसंशयम् । तद्वत्त्वमप्यधार्मिष्ठ सदा वाचः प्रभाषसे ॥ ३१ ॥ इच्छतां भूमिपालानां भीष्म जीवस्यसंशयम् । लोकविद्विष्टकर्मा हि नान्योऽस्ति भवता समः" ॥ ३२ ॥ In the Calcutta edition of 1834, the chapters are XL and XLIII respectively. Raghunātha's remark on the simile is as follows:—

" यो भूलिङ्गन्यायेन परोपदेशमात्रकुशलः स्वयं च यथेष्टाचरणशीलः सोऽपि दांभिकत्वात्त्यक्तव्यः । भूलिङ्गाख्यः पक्षी मा साहसं कुर्विति पुनः पुनरुच्चैर्वदन्सिंहदंष्ट्रान्तर्लग्नं मांसलवं जिघृक्षतीति प्रसिद्धम् ॥" For the following interesting example of the application of this nyāya (though the bird is not mentioned by name) I am indebted to my friend Mr. C. H. Tawney, C. I. E. It is found on pages 138-9 of the *Paris'istaparvan*:—" ततः कमलवत्यूचे हे नाथ कमलानन । मासाहसशकुनिवन्मा त्वं साहसिको भव ॥ १४१ ॥ तथा ह्येकः पुमान्देशान्तरे दुर्भिक्षपीडितः । चचाल स्वजनं हित्वा सार्थेन महता सह ॥ १४२ ॥ एकस्यां च महाटव्यां सार्थ आवासिते सति । आहर्तुं तृणकाष्ठादि स एकोऽपि विनिर्ययौ ॥ १४३ ॥ तदा च सुप्तव्याघ्रास्यात्पक्ष्येको वनगह्वरे । दन्तलग्नामिषखण्डान्यादायारोहद्द्रुमम् ॥१४४॥ मा साहसमिति मुहुः स भणन्मांसखादकः । शकुनिस्तेन जगदे पुरुषेण सविस्मयम् ॥ १४५ ॥ रौषि मा साहसमिति व्याघ्रास्यान्मांसमत्सि च । मुग्धस्त्वं दृश्यसे वाचोऽनुरूपं कुरुषे न च ॥ १४६ ॥ हित्वा साक्षाद्भवसुखं तददृष्टसुखेच्छया । तपश्चिकीर्षुस्त्वमसि मासाहसखगोपमः" ॥ १४७ ॥ An interesting conversation on the inconsistency of not practising what one preaches (though not in connection with this nyāya) is found also in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* x. 33. 27-40.

भौतविचारन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the reflections of a madman*. The story connected with this is told in the following passage of *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 64:—" तच्चेद्विचारासहं किं तेन भौतविचारकल्पेन । तथाहि केनचिद्भौतेन राजद्वारि द्विरदमालोक्य विकल्पितं किमयमन्धकारो मूलकमत्त्याहोस्विज्जलवाहो बलाकान्वर्षति गर्जति च । यद्वा बान्धवोऽयं 'राजद्वारे श्मशाने च यस्तिष्ठति स बान्धवः' इति परमाचार्यवचनात्* । अथवा योऽयं भूमौ दृश्यते तस्य छायेति दूषितं च । तत्र नाद्यस्तस्य सूर्पयुगलप्रस्फोटनाभावात् । न द्वितीयस्तस्य स्तंभचतुष्टयाभावात् । न तृतीयस्तस्य लगुडभ्रामणाभावात् । न चतुर्थस्तस्य नरशिरःशतोद्गिरणाभावात् । ततो न किञ्चिदिदमिति । किमेतावता द्विरदरूपं निवर्तताम् " ॥

---

* *Pancatantra* V. 41 (*Indische Sprüche* 1221).

मणिप्रभामणिमतिन्यायः ॥

The supposition that the light of a gem is itself the gem. This follows Mr. A. E. Gough's explanation of a slightly varied form of the nyāya which is found in the Bauddha section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha.* He adds that, in this case, "we may yet handle the gem, because it underlies the light, while, if we were to take nacre for silver, we could not lay hold of any silver." The correctness of this view is established by an important passage at the beginning of *Pancadas'ī* IX, which treats of ध्यान as a means of arriving at a right knowledge of Brahman. Such meditation, being directed towards Brahman with qualities, is of course erroneous, inasmuch as that Impersonality has no qualities; but it nevertheless leads to the underlying *nirguṇa* Brahman, just as the mistaken notion regarding the sparkle of the gem leads to the discovery of the gem itself. This is styled संवादिभ्रम, an error which has a corresponding reality underlying it. To mistake the distant shining of a lamp through the keyhole of a door for a gem, is an illustration of विसंवादिभ्रम, an error entirely devoid of an underlying reality. The passage is as follows:—"मणिप्रदीपप्रभयोर्मणिबुद्ध्याभिधावतोः । मिथ्याज्ञानाविशेषेऽपि विशेषोऽर्थक्रियां प्रति ॥ २ ॥ दीपोऽपवरकस्यान्तर्वर्त्तते तत्प्रभा बहिः । दृश्यते द्वार्य्यथान्यत्र तद्वद्दृष्टा मणेः प्रभा ॥ ३ ॥ दूरे प्रभाद्वयं दृष्ट्वा मणिबुद्ध्याभिधावतोः । प्रभायां मणिबुद्धिस्तु मिथ्याज्ञानं द्वयोरपि ॥ ४ ॥ न लभ्यते मणिर्दीपप्रभां प्रत्यभिधावता । प्रभायां धावतावश्यं लभ्येतैव मणिर्मणेः ॥ ५ ॥ दीपप्रभामणिभ्रान्तिर्विसंवादिभ्रमः स्मृतः । मणिप्रभामणिभ्रान्तिः संवादिभ्रम उच्यते ॥ ६ ॥ The commentator, Rāmakṛishṇa, ascribes verses 2-5 to a *vārtika;* whilst Citsukha Muni, in his comment on verse 2 which is quoted in the *Nyāyamakaranda* (page 148), names Dharmakīrti as its author. This is not improbable; for Dharmakīrti is known to have composed *vārtikas* on the works of Dignāga, a famous Buddhist writer of the sixth century (See Mr. K. B. Pāṭhak's paper "On the authorship of the Nyāyabindu"). In *Nyāyamanjarī*, pages 24 (line 1), 33 (line 4 from bottom), and 158

(line 10), the nyāya is found as मणिप्रभामणिबुद्धिवत्. Then on page 308 (line 9 from bottom) there is the following passage which corresponds with the extract from *Pancadas'ī*, namely:— अर्थं हि मूलवर्तिनमुपलभ्य प्रवर्तमानस्तमाप्नोति अपवरकनिहितमणिप्रसृतायां कुञ्चिकाविवरनिर्गतायामिव प्रभायां मणिबुद्ध्या प्रवर्तमानः । यत्र तु मूलेऽप्यर्थो नास्ति तत्र व्यामोहात्प्रवर्तमानो विप्रलभ्यते दीपप्रभायामिव तथैव मणिबुद्ध्या प्रवर्तमानः ॥ The nyāya occurs again on page 317.

Other references to it are *S'ālikā*, page 22, line 4; *Nyāyakandalī*, page 190; *Atmatattvaviveka*, page 45; and *Tārkikarakṣā*, page 16.

मणिविक्रयदृष्टान्तः ॥

The illustration afforded by *the sale of gems.* It is intended to teach that, in disposing of precious stones, one who understands their value will derive greater advantage than one who is without that knowledge. This would undoubtedly be the case if the seller were a S'abara and the buyer a dealer in gems! The illustration is S'ankara's, and is used by him in his exposition of *Chhāndogya* 1. 1. 10, which sets forth the value of an *intelligent* use of the syllable *Om*. The passage is as follows:—" तेनोभौ कुरुतो यश्चैतदेवं वेद यश्च न वेद । नाना तु विद्या चाविद्या च । यदेव विद्यया करोति...तदेव वीर्यवत्तरं भवति." An objector here urges that the result of an action does not depend upon the intelligence of the performer of it, but on the due performance of the act itself, and he supports his view with the following homely illustration " दृष्टं हि लोके हरीतकीं भक्षयतोस्तद्रसाभिज्ञेतरयोर्विरेचनम्." The Sidhāntin disallows this, and gives another illustration:—" दृष्टं हि लोके वणिक्शबरयोः पद्मरागादिमणिविक्रये वणिजो विज्ञानाधिक्यात्फलाधिक्यम् । तस्माद्यदेव विद्यया विज्ञानेन युक्तः सन्करोति कर्म...तदेव कर्म वीर्यवत्तरमविद्वत्कर्मणोऽधिकफलं भवति." ॥

The nyāya is quoted, in a slightly different form, by Ānandagiri in his comment on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 3. 3. 42; and again, by Amalānanda, in the same connection, in company with the drug-illustration.

मण्डूकवसाक्ताक्षाणां वंशेषूरगभ्रमः ॥

Mistaking bamboos for snakes on the part of those whose eyes have been smeared with the fat of frogs. This curious illustration, taken from *S'lokavārtika*, page 520, is found in the following passage of *Tātparyaṭīkā*, page 314 :—" न च मण्डूकवसाक्ताक्षाणामिवानवगतास्मृतोरगाणामपि प्रथमाक्षसन्निपाताद्वंशेषूरगारोप इति साम्प्रतम् । सर्वासामेव भ्रान्तीनां प्रमाणगृहीतारोप्यारोपविषयग्रहणपुरःसरत्वनियमात् । तदनुसारेण मण्डूकवसाक्ताक्षाणामपि वंशेषूरगभ्रमो व्याख्येयः । वंशानां तावदस्ति भूयः सारूप्यमुरगेण तेन चैते तन्मात्रेण रूपेण शक्नुवन्ति गृहीताः स्मारयितुमुरगम् । एवमपि यदन्येषां भ्रमो न भवति तत्र सर्पाकारव्यावृत्तवंशग्रहो हेतुः मण्डूकवसाञ्जनं च वंशाकारपिधानमात्रहेतुः" ॥

The *S'lokavārtika* passage containing the nyāya forms the second quotation in the following excerpt from *Sarvārthasiddhi* on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii. 64 :—" संकोचकानां निश्शेषक्षीणत्वान्न चात्र ' काणतां जनयेद्दीपो निम्बवृन्दाकरेणुमान् ' इतिवत्किञ्चिन्निमित्तमन्तरेण स्वतःप्राप्तप्रकाशैकदेशभङ्गः स्यात् । 'मण्डूकवसयाक्ताक्षा वंशानुरगबुद्धिभिः' इतिवद्वा केनचिद्धेतुना प्रागनुकूलेषु प्रतिकूलबुद्धिर्युक्ता " ॥ Another instance of the nyāya is to be found in *Parimala*, page 43, line 9.

मात्स्यन्यायः ॥

The simile *drawn from fish*. It is used to illustrate the oppression of the weak by the strong. In Raghunāthavarman's list, it follows the सुन्दोपसुन्दन्याय, and he explains it thus:—"अयं [सुन्दोपसुन्दन्यायः] तुल्यबलयोर्विरोधे प्रसरति । प्रबलनिर्बलविरोधे सबलेन निर्बलबाधविवक्षायां तु मात्स्यन्यायावतारः । अयं प्राय इतिहासपुराणादिषु दृश्यते । तथाहि वासिष्ठे प्रह्लादाख्याने तत्समाधिं प्रस्तुत्योक्तम् । 'एतावताथ कालेन तद्रसातलमण्डलम् । बभूवाराजकं तीक्ष्णं मात्स्यन्यायकदर्थितम् ' ॥ यथा प्रबला मत्स्या निर्बलांस्तान्नाशयन्ति तथाराजकेऽमुकदेशे प्रबला जना निर्बलान्नरान्नाशयन्तीति न्यायार्थः " ॥ The verse quoted here is

Yogavāsiṣtha 5. 37. 7. There is a good example of the usage of this nyāya in *Kāmandakīya-Nītisāra* ii. 40 which reads thus:—"परस्परामिषतया जगतो भिन्नवर्त्मनः। दण्डाभावे परिध्वंसी मात्स्यो न्यायः प्रवर्तते" ॥ My friend Mr. Tawney has given me a reference to the commentary on i. 13 of the same work, and also to *Kathāsaritsāgara* cii. 63 which I here subjoin together with his translation (vol. ii, page 390):—"नास्त्येवाराजकं किञ्चिद्वत कोऽपि प्रजास्वहो। राजशब्दः सुरैः सृष्टो मात्स्यन्यायभयादयम्" ॥ "There is no race in the world without a king; I do believe the gods introduced the magical name among men in their alarm, fearing that otherwise the strong would devour the weak, as great fishes eat the little." Kullūka gives "जले मत्स्यानिवाहिंस्युः" as a various reading in the second line of *Manu* vii. 20, and adds "अत्र बलवन्तो दुर्बलान्हिंस्युरिति मत्स्यन्याय एव स्यादित्युक्तम्" ॥ For this, also, I am indebted to Mr. Tawney.

मारणाय गृहीतोऽङ्गच्छेदं स्वीकरोति ॥

One who has been seized in order to be put to death, [gladly] *agrees to the amputation of a limb* [as an alternative]. The nearest approach to this nyāya of Raghunātha's is found in the following verse of *Bodhicaryāvatāra* (vi. 72):—

"मारणीयः करं छित्त्वा मुक्तश्चेत्किमभद्रकम्।
मनुष्यदुःखैर्नरकान्मुक्तश्चेत्किमभद्रकम्" ॥

On the former part of this, the commentator says:—"यो हि मारणमर्हति स यदि हस्तमात्रं छित्त्वा मुच्यते तदा न काचित्क्षतिरस्ति प्रत्युत लब्धलाभमात्मानं मन्यते। अत्यल्पमिदं मरणदुःखात्करच्छेदनदुःखमिति"।

मालतीगन्धगुणविद्भे न रमते ह्यलिः ॥

The bee that knows the excellence of the perfume of jasmine cares not for darbha grass. This is found in the following passage of *Upamitibhavaprapancā Kathā,* page 1031:—

" अत एवागमज्ञस्य या क्रिया सा क्रियोच्यते ।
आगमज्ञोऽपि यस्तस्यां यथाशक्त्या प्रवर्तते ॥
चिन्तामणिस्वरूपज्ञो दौर्गत्योपहतो नहि ।
तत्प्राप्त्युपायवैचित्र्ये सत्यन्यत्र प्रवर्तते ॥
न चासौ तत्स्वरूपज्ञो योऽन्यत्रापि प्रवर्तते ।
मालतीगन्धगुणविद्भे न रमते ह्यलिः" ॥

माषराशिप्रविष्टमषीन्यायः ॥

The simile of *a grain of soot in a heap of spotted beans.* Perhaps akin to a needle in a haystack. It seems to have originated in that very ancient drama the *Mṛicchakaṭika* where it is found (on page 40) in the following Prākṛit passage:— " शकारः ॥ भावे भावे बलिए क्खु अन्धआले माशलाशिपविट्टा विअ मशीगुडिआ दीशन्ती दीशन्ती जेव पणट्टा वशन्तशेणिआ " ॥ (=भाव बलवत्यन्धकारे माषराशिप्रविष्टेव मशीगुडिका दृश्यमानैव प्रनष्टा वसन्तसेना). In vol. ix of the Harvard Oriental Series, Dr. A. W. Ryder (in imitation of the शकार) renders it thus:—"But mashter, it's pitch dark and it's like hunting for a grain of soot in a pile of shpotted beans. Now you shee Vasantasenā and now you don't."

The nyāya is quoted in Udayana's *Kiraṇāvali,* page 79:— "स तु माषराशिप्रविष्टमशीवन्महाप्रकाशसमाहारान्नेक्ष्यते", and again on pages 208 and 451 of Venkaṭanātha's *Sarvārthasiddhi,* the latter being as follows:—"यथा माषराशौ मषी यथा वा नीलोत्पलवने कादम्बस्तद्भेदाग्रहात्तदपृथग्भावेनाभिमन्यते व्यवह्रियते च."

मिथिलायां प्रदीप्तायां न मे दह्यति किञ्चन ॥

If Mithilā should be in flames nothing of mine would be burnt up. This is the second line of a verse in *S'āntiparva*, chapter 178, the first line being "अनन्तं बत मे वित्तं यस्य मे नास्ति किञ्चन". It is used to indicate the freedom from anxiety of one who has nothing to lose; like Juvenal's "*Cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator.*" S'ankara quotes the phrase in his exposition of the words "न ह्यस्य कर्म क्षीयते।" in *Bṛihadāraṇyakopanishad* 1. 4. 15:—"न ह्यस्य कर्म क्षीयते। कर्माभावादेवेति नित्यानुवादः। यथाविदुषः कर्मक्षयलक्षणं संसारदुःखं सन्ततमेव न तथा तदस्य विद्यत इत्यर्थः। मिथिलायां प्रदीप्तायां न मे दह्यति किञ्चनेति यद्वत्" ॥ It appears also in the following verse of the *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya*, page 278:—

"तथाहि मिथिलानाथो मुमुक्षुर्निर्ममः पुरा।
आहेदं मिथिलादाहे न मे किञ्चन दह्यते" ॥

मुण्डितशिरोनक्षत्रान्वेषणम् ॥

Enquiring as to a suitable date for the shaving of one's head when one has already performed that ceremony! It occurs in the following passage of the *Nyāyamanjarī*, page 171:—"यत्पुनः कालान्तरे तन्निश्चयकरणे दूषणमितरेतराश्रयत्वं वा मुण्डितशिरोनक्षत्रान्वेषणवद्वैयर्थ्यं वेति वर्णितं तत्रादृष्टे विषये प्रामाण्यनिश्चयपूर्विकायाः प्रवृत्तेरभ्युपगमान्नेतरेतराश्रयं चक्रकं वा" ॥ This saying was explained to me by my learned friend the Principal of the Government Sanskrit College at Benares. It is similar to two given by Raghunāthavarman, namely, "कृते कार्ये किं मुहूर्तप्रश्नेन," and "न हि विवाहानन्तरं वरपरीक्षा क्रियते." See also कृतक्षौरस्य नक्षत्रपरीक्षा in the *Third Handful.*

मूषासिक्तताम्रन्यायः ॥

The simile of [molten] *copper poured into a mould* [and assuming its shape]. Raghunāthavarman expounds it thus:—"चक्षुरादिद्वारा बहिर्निःसृतस्यान्तःकरणस्य मूषासिक्तताम्रन्यायेन विषयाकारता भवति । तदुक्तं भगवत्पादैः । 'मूषासिक्तं यथा ताम्रं तन्निभं जायते तथा । रूपादीन्व्याप्नुवच्चित्तं तन्निभं दृश्यते ध्रुवमिति". This verse is S'ankarācārya's *Upades'asāhasrī* xiv. 3, on which Rāmatīrtha comments as follows:—"मूषान्तःसुषिरा मृत्प्रतिमा । यथाग्निसंपर्काद्द्रवीभूतं ताम्रं मूषायां निषिक्तं निक्षिप्तं सत्तन्निभं जायते तत्समानाकृति भवति तथा चित्तमपि रूपादीन्विषयान्व्याप्नुवत्तन्निभं दृश्यते तदाकारं जायत इत्यर्थः" ॥

I may add that the nyāya which immediately follows this in Raghunātha's list, namely व्यञ्जकव्यंग्यन्याय, is based on the very next verse of the *Upades'asāhasrī* ["व्यञ्जको वा यथा लोकः &c."], and his explanatory remarks are taken *verbatim* from Rāmatīrtha's comment. The nyāya we are now examining appears also in *Brahmasūtrabhāshya* 1. 1. 12 in the expression "मूषानिषिक्तद्रुतताम्रादिप्रतिमावत्", and in *Taittirīyavārtika* (p. 94):—"विद्यादन्नमयेनैव मूषायां द्रुतताम्रवत् । सर्वान्प्राणमयादींस्तान्चितान्पुरुषाकृतीन्."

मूषिकभक्षितबीजादावङ्कुरादिजननप्रार्थना ॥

Looking for the production of germs when the seed has been eaten by a mouse! This seems to belong to the same category as the काकदन्तपरीक्षा. It occurs in the Bauddha chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 14 of Jīvānanda's edn.). The whole passage is too long for quotation, but the nyāya-portion is as follows:—"द्वितीये स्थायित्ववृत्त्याशा मूषिकभक्षितबीजादावङ्कुरादिजननप्रार्थनामनुहरेत्" ॥

मृतं दुण्डुभमासाद्य काकोऽपि गरुडायते ॥

Even a [cowardly] *crow can assume the bearing of an eagle, when it comes upon a dead lizard!* This is the first line of *Bodhicaryāvatāra* vii. 72, the second being

" आपदाबाधतेऽल्पापि मनो मे यदि दुर्बलम् " ॥

How true to nature this is!

यः कारयति स करोत्येव ॥

He who causes a thing to be done by another is himself the real doer of it. "Facit per alium facit per se". This nyāya is of common occurrence. There is a good instance of it in Ānandagiri's comment on *Brahmasūtrabhāshya* 1. 2. 11. Explaining *Muṇḍaka Upanishad* 3. 1. 1, S'ankara says:—"एवमेकेनापि पिबता द्वौ पिबन्तावुच्येते । यद्वा जीवस्तावत्पिबतीश्वरस्तु पाययति पाययन्नपि पिबतीत्युच्यते । पाचयितर्यपि पक्तृत्वप्रसिद्धिदर्शनात्" ॥ on which Ānandagiri remarks:—"पाययन्निति । प्रधानकर्तरि प्रयोगो गुणकर्तरि कथमित्याशंक्याह पाचयितरीति । यः कारयति स करोत्येवेति न्यायादित्यर्थः" ॥ See also *Tātparyaṭīkā*, page 187, line 1.

यत्कृतकं तदनित्यम् ॥

Anything that has been made is non-eternal. In other words, that which has a beginning has also an end; except of course, the Naiyāyika's प्रध्वंसाभाव, which has a beginning but no end! The nyāya is found in the *Nyāyabindu*, page 108, and its converse, यदनित्यं तत्कृतकम्, on page 116. The following are additional examples of its use. *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, page 240, line 3:—"अतो यत्कृतकं तदनित्यमित्यादिन्यायानुसारेणानित्यत्वादिकं मोक्षस्य प्राप्नोति" ॥ *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā*, page 187 line 8 from bottom:—"एवमनित्यं शब्दं बुभुत्समानायानित्यः शब्द

इत्यनुक्त्वा यदेव किंचिदुच्यते कृतकत्वादिति वा यत्कृतकं तदनित्यमिति वा कृतकश्च शब्द इति वा तत्सर्वमस्यानपेक्षितमापाततोऽसंबद्धाभिधानं तथा चानवहितो न बोद्धुमर्हतीति । यत्कृतकं तत्सर्वमनित्यं यथा घटः कृतकश्च शब्द इति वचनमर्थसामर्थ्येनैवापेक्षितशब्दानित्यत्वनिश्चायकमित्यवधानमत्रेति चेन्न परस्पराश्रयत्वप्रसंगात्" ॥ Part of this latter passage is quoted in *Citsukhī* i. 23 (Paṇḍit, vol. V. page 27).

यदश्वेन हृतं पुरा तत्पश्चाद्गर्दभः प्राप्तुं केनोपायेन शक्नुयात् ॥

By what means can a donkey overtake [so as to bring back] *that which has been carried off long before by* [one mounted on] *a horse?* This phrase, borrowed from *Tantravārtika* (page 730), is introduced into the *Nyāyamanjarī* (page 262) in the course of a discussion on the relative value and authority of *S'ruti* and *Smṛiti,* in the following verse:—

"सोऽयमाभाणको लोके यदश्वेन हृतं पुरा ।
तत्पश्चाद्गर्दभः प्राप्तुं केनोपायेन शक्नुयात्" ॥

According to Kumārila, a man who has accepted the teaching of s'ruti will not allow it to be upset by a contradictory smṛiti, and *vice versā.* This is expressed, as follows, in two passages of *Tantravārtika* 1. 3. 3. (as pointed out by the editor of *Nyāyamanjarī.*):—"न च श्रुतिजनितप्रत्ययस्य स्मृतिजनितो बाधकत्वं प्रतिपद्यते ॥ स्मार्त्तस्य बाधकः श्रौतो बलवत्त्वात्प्रतीयते । प्रत्यक्षे चानुमाने च प्रागेतद्ध्यवधारितम् ॥ ...... न च शीघ्रहृतेऽर्थेऽस्ति चिरादागच्छतो गतिः । अश्वैरपहृतं को हि गर्दभैः प्राप्तुमर्हति" ॥ Page 92. Again on page 94:—"यो हि श्रुतिं प्रथममश्रुत्वा स्मृतिमेवैकां पश्यति तस्याप्रतिहतश्रुत्यनुमाने वृत्ते ॥ न पश्चाच्छ्रूयमाणापि श्रुतिः स्यात्प्रतिबन्धिका । गर्दभेनापनीतं हि हरेन्नाश्वश्चिराद्गतः" ॥

यद्विशेषयोः कार्यकारणभावोऽसति बाधके तत्सामान्ययोरपि ॥

This nyāya is found in Raghunātha's larger work, the *Laukikanyāyaratnākar* (India Office MS. 582, page 185 *a*), and on page 6 of *S'ikhāmaṇiṭīkā.* Prof. Cowell, however, quoted and explained it in a footnote to his translation of Haridāsa's comment on *Kusumānjali* v. 4. I quote a portion of the comment to elucidate the note. "You may not say that 'the volition of the conscious agent is the cause in effort only, and not in all action generally,' because even though a particular kind of volition may be the cause in the case of effort, this does not preclude volition generally; otherwise, because a particular seed is the cause of a particular shoot, it would follow that seeds in general [*i. e.* the class, seed] could not be the causes of shoots in general." The following is the footnote. "This argument depends on two principles,–*a. The same relation of cause and effect which exists between particulars, exists likewise between their respective classes,* 'यद्विशेषयोः कार्यकारणभावस्तत्सामान्ययोरपि' and *b. the general causes only produce their effects when conjoined with the particular causes,* 'सामान्यसामग्री विशेषसामग्रीसहितैव कार्यं जनयति.' Thus Archbishop Whately has made a book on Logic,—man can therefore make logical books; only in each particular case we require the concurrents, education, leisure &c."

यादृशो यक्षस्तादृशो वलिः ॥

As is the Yaksha so should be the offering. This is included in Raghunātha's list, but without any definition of its meaning. It is embedded, however, in the philosophical part of his

treatise, as follows:—“यस्त्वनेकजन्मार्जितपापपुञ्जजन्यदुराग्रहादेकभक्तिच्छलेनान्यं निन्दति असकृद्बोध्यमानोऽपि चर्जुमार्गेणाभेदं नोपैति भ्रामयति च मन्दान्स यादृशो यक्षस्तादृशो बलिरिति न्यायात्तत्प्रतिपादितोत्कर्षापकर्षविपरीतोत्कर्षापकर्षोपपादनेन विजित्य पश्चात्पूर्वोक्तरीत्यात्यन्ताभेदोपपादनेन बोधनीयः । एवं हि स मारणाय गृहीतोऽङ्गच्छेदं स्वीकरोतीति न्यायेनाभेदं स्वीकरिष्यति” ॥

I have found the nyāya in use in the following works of Vācaspatimis'ra's and of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa. In the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā,* page 115:—“अहृदयवाचामहृदया एव प्रतिवाचो भवन्ति । यक्षानुरूपो बलिरिति हि लौकिकानामाभाणकः ॥” Also in the *Bhāmatī* 4. 1. 15 (page 723):—“न च कार्यमपि भयकम्पादि वस्तुसत् । तस्यापि विचारासहत्वेनानिर्वाच्यत्वात् । अनिर्वाच्याच्चानिर्वाच्योत्पत्तौ नानुपपत्तिः । यादृशो यक्षस्तादृशो बलिरिति सर्वमवदातम्” ॥ The two which follow are from the *Nyāyamanjarī.* Page 54:—

“अभावश्च क्वचिल्लिङ्गमिष्यते भावसंविदः ।
वृष्ट्यभावोऽपि वाय्वभ्रसंयोगस्यानुमापकः ॥
तस्माद्युक्तमभावस्य नाभावेनैव वेदनम् ।
न नाम यादृशो यक्षो बलिरप्यस्य तादृशः” ॥

On page 637:—

“यादृग्यक्षो बलिरपि तथेत्येवमाधाय बुद्धौ
यस्तु ब्रूयात्कलुषमफलस्तस्य शुद्धोऽपि हेतुः” ।

It occurs also in S'rīdhara's *Nyāyakandalī,* page 144, line 13, and, finally, in the vṛitti on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii. 49, where it is immediately followed by “पिशाचानां पिशाचभाषयैवोत्तरं देयमिति न्यायाच्च.” The general sense of the nyāya would seem to be that of “tit-for-tat”, “a Roland for an Oliver.”

यावद्वचनं वाचनिकम् ॥

Conveying the meaning actually expressed [and therefore needing nothing to supplement it]. Kumārila puts it thus in *Tantravārtika* 3. 5. 19:—"कश्चात्र विशेषः । स यदि वाचनिकस्ततो यावद्वचनमेव कर्तव्यः" ॥ Compare, too, the latter part of S'abara on 2. 3. 2. It occurs twice in *Bhāmatī*. On 4. 1. 4 (page 710) we read:—"यस्माद्यस्य यन्मात्रात्मतयोपासनं विहितं तस्य तन्मात्रात्मतयैव प्रतिपत्तव्यं यावद्वचनं वाचनिकमिति न्यायान्नाधिकमध्याहर्तव्यमतिप्रसङ्गात्" ॥ Again on 4. 3. 4 (page 742) as follows:—"न चामानवस्य पुरुषस्य विद्युदादिषु वोढृत्वदर्शनादर्चिरादीनामपि वोढृत्वमुन्नेयं यावद्वचनं हि वाचनिकं न तदवाच्ये सञ्चारयितुमुचितम्" ॥ Ānandagiri, too, quotes the nyāya in his comment on 4. 3. 4. He says:—"अमानवपुरुषस्य विद्युदादावातिवाहिकत्वदृष्टेरर्चिरादीनामपि तदुन्नेयमित्यर्थः । यावद्वचनं वाचनिकमिति न्यायान्न तेषामातिवाहिकत्वसाधकमेतदिति शंकते तदिति" ॥ It is found also in the philosophical portion of *Laukikanyāyasangraha* (I. O. MS. 1031, page 45 *b.*):—"या तु पिशाचमोचनाख्याने पिशाचस्यापि तत्स्नानात्पैशाच्यनाशोक्तिः सा निषादस्थपतीष्टिवद्यावद्वचनं तावद्वाचनिकमिति न्यायात्तन्मात्रविषयैव । न च लिङ्गस्य काशीप्रवेशात्पापनाशे वचोऽस्ति तस्मात्काश्युत्पन्नविषयाणि तत्तल्लिङ्गदर्शनादिनैकब्यादिजन्मपापक्षयबोधकानि वचांसीत्याहुः" ॥ See, too, Nāges'a's Uddyota, vol. i. p. 574.

राजपुत्रव्याधन्यायः ॥

The illustration of *the king's son* [who was brought up] *as a hunter*. The story is that a young prince, abandoned by his parents at his birth, was adopted by a hunter and brought up as his own son. The boy remained in ignorance of his real origin until he was discovered by a kindly person and restored to his rightful position. S'ankarācārya seems to have been the first to utilize the tale, and he gives it as follows in his bhāṣya on *Bṛihadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 2. 1. 20:—

"अत्र च संप्रदायविद आख्यायिकां संप्रचक्षते । कश्चित्किल राजपुत्रो जातमात्र एव मातापितृभ्यामपविद्धो व्याधगृहे संवर्धितः । सोऽमुष्य वंशतामजानन्व्याधजातिप्रत्ययो व्याधजातिकर्माण्येवानुवर्तते न राजास्मीति राजजातिकर्माण्यनुवर्तते । यदा पुनः कश्चित्परमकारुणिको राजपुत्रस्य राजश्रीप्राप्तियोग्यतां जानन्नमुष्य पुत्रतां बोधयति न त्वं व्याधोऽमुष्य राज्ञः पुत्रः कथंचिद्व्याधगृहमनुप्रविष्ट इति स एवं बोधितस्त्यक्त्वा व्याधजातिप्रत्ययकर्माणि पितृपैतामहीमात्मनः पदवीमनुवर्तते राजाहमस्मीति."

Sure'svara refers to this several times in his large Vārtika. On page 71 we read:—"तच्चाविद्यानिरास्येव व्याधभावनयाश्रितः । राजसूनोः स्मृतिप्राप्तौ व्याधभावो निवर्तते." Then, on pages 970–2, he devotes ten verses to the nyāya, and returns to it once more on page 1845.

The author of the *Siddhāntales'a* (on page 20) cites it as the "व्याधकुलसंवर्धितराजकुमारदृष्टान्त," and it is reproduced, in a slightly different form, in the comments of Aniruddha and Vedāntin Mahādeo on *Sānkhyasūtra* iv. 1. See also *Bhāmatī* 1. 4. 22. Raghunāthavarman links with the above the सिंहमेषन्याय which tells of a lion's cub being brought up as a ram; but I have not yet met with it elsewhere.

राजपुरप्रवेशन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the manner of entering a royal city.* It is found in both of Raghunāthavarma's treatises, but the following explanation of it is taken from the *Vācaspatyam*:—"विशृंखलतया राजपुरप्रवेशे राजपुररक्षकैस्ताडनादिकं क्रियेतेति भिया श्रेणीभूततया यथा तत्पुरप्रवेश एवं सुशृंखलतया यत्र कार्यकरणस्य विवक्षा तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ Raghunātha points out that we do not grasp the meaning of a long sentence as a whole, but that the sense of each word enters the mind singly, on the principle of राजपुरप्रवेश,—"तत्र हि क्रमेणैव बहूनां पुरुषाणां प्रवेशो भवति न युगपत्."

I have met with the nyāya in Nāges'a Bhaṭṭa's comment on Kaiyaṭa. In *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 58 (under vārtika 1) we read "अनानुपूर्व्येणापि संनिविष्टानां यथेष्टमभिसंबन्धो भवति । तद्यथा । अनड्वाहमुदहारि या त्वं हरसि शिरसा कुम्भं भगिनि साचीनमभिधावन्तमद्राक्षीरिति । तस्य यथेष्टमभिसंबन्धो भवति । उदहारि भगिनि या त्वं कुम्भं हरसि शिरसानड्वाहं साचीनमभिधावन्तमद्राक्षीरिति" ॥ Kaiyaṭa remarks on this:— "पाठक्रमादार्थक्रमो बलीयानिति यथेष्टमत्राभिसंबन्धः", and on these words Nāges'a says "आर्थक्रमो नाम राजपुरप्रवेशन्यायेन स्वस्याकांक्षितार्थान्वयक्रमः । एवं च कल्पितासन्नवाक्याद्बोधविषये तात्पर्यं नियामकमिति भावः" ॥ The passages here quoted will be found on pages 389 and 390 of vol. i. of the edition of *Mahābhāṣya* with the *Pradīpa* and *Uddyota*, published at the Nirṇayasāgar Press in 1908.

राजार्थौपयिकं नित्यमुष्ट्रो वहति कुंकुमम् ॥

This is the second line of a verse on page 372 of the *Tantravārtika*. To make it intelligible I quote a portion of the context as interpreted by Professor Gangānātha Jhā in his translation (page 511, last line):- " It has been urged above that, if the *Apūrva* inhere in the Soul, then it becomes only an end in itself desirable by men. But this does not affect our position; because one thing becomes subservient to another only when its sole use lies in the serving of some purpose of this latter, and not merely when it rests in this ; for instance, *though the Red Dye is carried by the camel* (and as such rests upon its back), *yet it serves the purposes of the king* (for whom it is carried)."

रुधिरसम्पर्कवतो विषस्य शरीरे प्रसर्पणम् ॥

The circulation within the body of poison which has entered the blood. Used as a warning against the beginnings of evil in however small a degree. The figure is found in *Bodhicaryāvatāra* vii. 69 :—

" विषं रुधिरमासाद्य प्रसर्पति यथा तनौ ।
तथैव छिद्रमासाद्य दोषश्चित्ते प्रसर्पति " ॥

The commentary runs thus:—" अणुमात्रस्यापि दोषस्यावकाशो न दातव्यः । अन्यथा तन्मात्रस्याप्यनुप्रवेशे चित्ते तत्प्रसरावरोधस्य कर्तुमशक्यत्वात् । यथा हि स्वल्पव्रणेऽपि रुधिरसम्पर्कवतो विषस्य शरीरे । तस्मादणुमात्रक्लेशप्रहार-निवारणेऽपि तात्पर्यं कुर्यात्." Compare "The beginning of strife is as when one letteth out water; therefore leave off contention before there be quarrelling."

रुमाक्षिप्तकाष्ठन्यायः ॥

The illustration of *wood thrown into the salt-lake* [or mine] *Rumā*. The *Medinī* kos'a explains Rumā as " विशिष्टलवणाकरे ", and it is said to be situated near Ajmere. The tradition is that anything thrown in there becomes saline itself. The earliest mention of Rumā, with which I am acquainted, is in the following verse of *Tantravārtika* (page 132):—

" यथा रुमायां लवणाकरेषु मेरौ यथा वोज्वलरुक्मभूमौ ।
यज्जायते तन्मयमेव तत्स्यात्तथा भवेद्वेदविदात्मतुष्टिः " ॥

Kumārila seems here to regard Rumā as the *region* in which the salt mines are situated, rather than as the mine itself; and this may give some ground for the footnote by the editor of the *Medinī*, (Calcutta, 1869) where he defines विशिष्टलवणाकरः as "लवणखनिभूयिष्टदेशविशेषः." In his translation of the above verse, Prof. Gangānātha Jhā omits Rumā altogether. He says :— "Just as in the case of salt mines, and in that of Meru the land of bright gold, whatever is produced in them, becomes salt and gold (respectively),—so also in the case of the inner satisfaction of one who knows the Veda (which imparts Vedic authority to all that it touches)."

We have an example of the nyāya in Vācaspati Mis'ra's comment on *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* iv. 14. The sūtra is "परिणामैकत्वाद्वस्तुतत्त्वम्" on which he says :—"बहूनामप्येकः परिणामो दृष्टः । तद्यथा । गवाश्वमहिषमातङ्गानां रुमानिक्षिप्तानामेको लवणत्वजातीयलक्षणः परिणामो वर्तितैलानलानां च प्रदीप इति." Then Venkaṭanātha uses the illustration in *Tattvamuktākalāpa* v. 28, and in his vṛitti thereon, as follows :—

"स्वादुष्णः कृष्णवर्त्मा सलिलमपि तथा शीतमस्तु प्रकृत्या
स्पर्शोऽन्योऽप्यत्र दृष्टस्स तु भवतु रुमाक्षिप्तलावण्यवच्चेत्" ।

"उष्णः कृष्णवर्त्मा तथैव जलमपि शीतमित्युपलभ्यते प्रकृत्या । अत्र कश्चिदाह अन्योऽपि स्पर्शो दहने सलिले च कदाचिदुपलभ्यते स तु रुमाक्षिप्तकाष्ठादिलवणन्यायेन तस्यैव परिणतिविशेष इति." In the vṛitti on ii. 1 of the same, the author says :—"गुणसंक्रमो न क्वचिदपि । न चात्र रुमाक्षिप्तकाष्ठन्यायः" ॥

रूढिर्योगमपहरति ॥

Popular usage overpowers etymological meaning. There is a capital illustration of this in the *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha* .3 (pages 134, 135) where Bādarāyaṇa's first sūtra is under discussion :—"ननु जिज्ञासाशब्दो विचारे रूढः । भाष्यकारादिभिस्तत्र विचारविवक्षया प्रयुक्तत्वात् । अतो रूढिर्योगमपहरतीति न्यायेनावयवार्थस्वीकारो न युक्तस्ततोऽथशब्दोऽप्यधिकारार्थो भविष्यतीति विचारस्य प्रारब्धुं शक्यत्वादिति चेन्मैवम् । रूढिर्योगमपहरतीति न्यायस्यात्राप्रसरात् ।........ तत्र यः शब्द एकत्रार्थे रूढोऽपरत्र यौगिको यथा च्छागे रूढोऽजशब्द आत्मनि यौगिकस्तत्राजं पश्येत्युक्ते रूढिर्योगमपहरतीति न्यायः प्रसरति । इह तु जिज्ञासाशब्दो न विचारे रूढः" ॥ The following verse is quoted in the *Nyāyapradīpa*, a commentary on *Tarkabhāṣā*, page 5 :—"लब्धात्मिका सती रूढिर्भवेद्योगापहारिणी । कल्पनीया तु लभते नात्मानं योगबाधतः" ॥ The editor cites a very modern author who ascribes the verse to Kumārila. See also *Pancapādikāvivaraṇa*, pp. 132-3; *Vedāntakalpataru*, p. 207; and Ānandagiri on *Brahmasūtrabhāshya*, 1. 3. 42.

रेखागवयन्यायः ॥

The illustration of *the sketch of the Bos Gavaeus* (Gayāl). Raghunāthavarmā explains and applies it as follows:—कीदृशो गवय इति ग्रामीणेन पृष्टो वन्यो लिखित्वा दर्शयामास स चर्जुबुद्धित्वाद्रेखागवयमेव गवयं मेने । पश्चाद्वने गवयं दृष्ट्वा रेखायां तद्बुद्धिं तत्याजेति लौकिकी गाथा । तथैष पुरुष इत्यादिश्रुतेः पूर्वोक्ततात्पर्यानभिज्ञोऽनात्मानमेवात्मतया जानीते । गुरुशास्त्रोपदेशेनात्मनि ज्ञाते तदात्मबुद्धिमपवदति." It is found on page 457 of Vācaspatimis'ra's *Tātparyaṭīkā*, and again on page 363 of *Vedāntakalpataruparimala*. The latter passage reads thus:—"यथा तात्त्विकारुन्धतीप्रतिपत्त्युपायतया नानापुरुषैः कल्प्यमानायां तत्प्राच्योदीच्यादिनक्षत्ररूपायां स्थूलारुन्धत्या यथा वा रेखागवयन्यायेन नित्यशब्दप्रतिपत्त्युपायतया नानाव्याकरणैः परस्परभिन्नप्रकृतिप्रत्ययविभागेन कृत्रिमशब्द इति भावः" ॥

A third example is found in the following extract from Kaiyaṭa on *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 46:—"असत्यप्रकृतिप्रत्ययोपदेशेन सत्यस्य पदस्य व्युत्पादनं क्रियते रेखागवयेनेव सत्यगवयस्य." See also *S'rībhāṣya* page 322, and page 77 of Dr. Thibaut's translation.

लक्षणप्रमाणाभ्यां वस्तुसिद्धिः ॥

[The existence, or nature, of] *an object is established by means of some distinguishing characteristic, and by a recognized form of proof* [such as sense-perception, scripture &c.]. "यथा गन्धवत्त्वादिलक्षणेन प्रत्यक्षप्रमाणेन च पृथिव्यादिसिद्धिः" ॥ Or, just as the wonders of creation establish the "eternal power and Godhead" of the invisible Deity, to which Scripture also bears testimony.

Raghunāthavarmā quotes the nyāya in the following passage on page 28 of the Benares edition of his work:—"एवमग्नीन्द्रादित्येश्वरवादा अपि तन्माहात्म्योपपादकश्रुतीतिहासपुराणवचनान्याश्रित्य तत्रैव

प्रपञ्चिता ज्ञेयाः । तत्तद्भक्ता अपि सर्गादिहेतुत्वरूपेश्वरलक्षणं श्रुत्यादिप्रमाणं च तत्र तत्र दर्शयन्तो लक्षणप्रमाणाभ्यां वस्तुसिद्धिरिति न्यायेनेश्वरत्वं साधयन्ति." Commenting on the opening verse of the *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, the author of the *S'ikhāmaṇi* says:—"ननु ब्रह्मणि लक्षणप्रमाणाभावेन तस्यैवासिद्धेः कथं जीवब्रह्माभेदः शास्त्रार्थ इति चेन्न तावत्प्रमाणाभावो भूतभौतिकोत्पत्तेरेव प्रमाणत्वात्." Amaradāsa's ṭikā on this begins as follows:—"लक्षणप्रमाणाभ्यां वस्तुसिद्धिरिति न्यायमाश्रित्याशंकते नन्विति."

लाङ्गलं जीवनम् ॥

A plough is existence. That is, it is a *means* of existence; cause and effect being here identified as in आयुर्घृतम्. The nyāya is found in Sures'vara's *Sambandhavārtika*, page 9, as follows:—"यथोक्तविद्याबोधित्वाद्ग्रन्थोऽपि तदभेदतः । भवेदुपनिषन्नामा लाङ्गलं जीवनं यथा." On which Ānandagiri remarks:—"साध्यसाधनयोरभेदोपचारेण साध्यशब्दस्य साधने प्रयोगे दृष्टान्तमाह लाङ्गलमिति." We may compare with this the phrase "The plough supports the bullocks", which occurs in *Brahmasūtrabhāshya* 3. 2. 4:—"यथा लाङ्गलं गवादीनुद्वहतीति निमित्तमात्रत्वादेवमुच्यते न तु प्रत्यक्षमेव लाङ्गलं गवादीनुद्वहति".

वधूमाषमापनन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the measuring out* [or distribution] *of beans by the daughter-in-law.* I am much indebted to Mr. Govind Dās, Honorary Magistrate of Benares, for giving me what seems to be the real meaning of this hitherto-puzzling nyāya. He believes it to be the adaptation of a Maithila proverb with which the following story is connected. "A very miserly old Brāhman used to have a *fistful* of grain given daily by his wife to every beggar who came to the door. The old man having

married his son, the idea struck him that if he got his daughter-in-law to do the distribution instead of his old and ugly wife, the smaller fist would measure out a smaller quantity of grain! But, unluckily for him, the girl was very beautiful, so even persons who were not in need began to drop in, disguised as beggars, in order to admire her! The result was that, while each measure was less, the total amount given away was very much more."

It occurs in the *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 87, line 12, as follows:– "न चानवस्था अवश्यवेद्यत्वानभ्युपगमान्निश्चयवदन्यथा त्वनिश्चितनिश्चयस्य नाद्यनिश्चयोऽपि सिध्येत न चासावात्मन्यनिश्चय इति तदिदं वधूमाषमापनवृत्तान्तमनुहरति" ॥

वध्यघातकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the *destroyer and its prey.* Used of two things which cannot exist together. It occurs in *Taittirīyavārtika* 2. 1. 66 (page 53):—" प्रतिपद्य पदार्थं हि विरोधात्तद्विरोधिनः । पश्चादभावं जानाति वध्यघातकवत्पदात्." Ānandagiri explains it thus:—"यथावच्छ्येनमूषकादिना दूषितां भूमिमुपलभ्य तद्विरोधिनो घातकस्य मार्जारादेरभावोऽर्थादवगम्यते तथा सत्यादिपदात्पदार्थं परमार्थत्वादिकं प्रतीत्य प्रतीतपरमार्थत्वादिविरोधिनोऽसत्यत्वादेरभावोऽर्थापत्त्या ज्ञायते न हि सत्यादेरसत्यादेश्चैकाधिकरणत्वं घटते". See also Pras'astapāda's *Vais'eshikabhāshya*, pages 112, 113; and the latter part of *Citsukhī* iv. 4. (Paṇḍit vi. 390). Compare the बाध्यबाधकभाव of *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* i. 55 (पञ्चास्योरणयोः), and iii. 85 (आखुनकुलयोः).

वनसिंहन्यायः ॥

The illustration of *a lion in a forest.* Used of things which mutually aid or protect each other. This, and the ह्रदनक्रन्याय which is of similar import, occur together in the following

10

passage of the *Vedāntakalpataruparimala* (page 100):— "सोऽयं वनसिंहह्रदनक्रन्यायः । किरातैर्हन्तुं शक्योऽपि सिंहो महद्वनं शरणं प्रविश्य दुराधर्षस्तेभ्यो न बिभेति वनं च तत्सिंहाधिष्ठानानुगृहीतं तैर्दुष्प्रवेशं भवति " ॥ Similarly, the lake shelters the alligator, and the alligator protects the lake. There is another reference to the वनसिंहन्याय on page 627 of the same work :—"तथा च वनसिंहन्यायेन प्रमाणतर्कन्यायेन वोभयोरप्यंशभेदेन परस्परापेक्षायामपि न परस्पराश्रयदोषः" ॥ The source of the nyāya is doubtless *Udyogaparva* xxxvii. 46, for the reference to which I am indebted to Professor Dr. R. Pischel. The verse is as follows :—

"न स्याद्वनमृते व्याघ्रान्व्याघ्रा न स्युर्ऋते वनम् ।
वनं हि रक्ष्यते व्याघ्रैर्व्याघ्रान् रक्षति काननम्" ॥

Compare also verse 64 of the same.

वरगोष्ठीन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the discussion of matters with a view to obtaining a husband* [for one's daughter]. It is thus explained by Raghunāthavarman :—"गोष्ठिरन्योन्यवार्ता वरलाभाय गोष्ठिर्वरगोष्ठिस्तया यथा वरवधूबन्धूनामैकमत्ये सति विवाहरूपमेकं कार्यं निष्पाद्यते तथेत्यर्थः" ॥ I have met with the expression twice in the *Pancapādikā* (pages 72, 73), in a description of the erroneous views of common people (such as the Laukāyatikas &c.) in regard to the *ātman*. The passages are as follows:—"एवमिन्द्रियाण्येव चेतनानि आत्मेत्यपरे । इन्द्रियाणां चक्षुरादिमनःपर्यन्तानामेकैकस्मिन्नसत्येव शरीरे रूपादिज्ञानानामभावात्तेषामेव व्यस्तानां चेतनत्वमहंप्रत्ययविषयत्वं च मन्यन्ते क्रमेण च वरगोष्ठीवदितरेतरगुणभावं च" ॥ Again :—"यदि तावद्व्यस्तानां युगपत्परिकल्प्येत ततः स्वार्थप्रयुक्तत्वात्प्रवृत्तेरङ्गाङ्गिभावो नावकल्पेत । न चाङ्गाङ्गिभावमन्तरेण संघात उपपद्यते । तस्मान्न व्यस्तेषु युगपद्भोगः । अस्तु तर्हि क्रमेण विरोधाद्वरगोष्ठीवदिति । नैतदेवं युक्तम्" ॥

It needs a more intimate acquaintance with वरगोष्ठी than we Westerns possess in order to grasp the full significance of the nyāya, and I must confess to a certain amount of haziness as to

its exact sense in the passages here cited. In a later part of his treatise Raghunātha gives us the maxim "यद्विवाहस्तद्गीतगानम्" appended to which is the remark "केचित्तु प्रागुदाहृतं वरगोष्ठिन्यायमेतदर्थकत्वेन व्याचक्षते." The way in which he applies the latter will be apparent from the following excerpt from the philosophical portion of his work:—"एवं हि वादिनो यद्विवाहस्तद्गीतगानमितिन्यायानुसारीणि स्वस्वेष्टदेवमाहात्म्यवाक्यानि पश्यन्तोऽन्यानि तु पश्यन्तोऽपि दुराग्रहपिनद्धदृष्टित्वादपश्यन्त इव तदेकवाक्यतादिकं चाजानन्तोऽन्धगजन्यायेनान्योन्यं विवदतेऽबुद्ध्वैव च मतान्तरं कूपमण्डूकन्यायान्निराकुर्वन्तो बुद्धैरुपहसनीयतां यान्ति" ॥ Compare Kumarila's "कन्यावरणार्थागतमूर्खवरगोत्रप्रश्नोत्तरवत् । यदेव भवतां गोत्रं तदस्माकमपीतिवत्" ॥ *Tantravārtika,* page 169-70. Prof. Gangānātha Jhā points out that if the would-be bridegroom was really of the same *gotra*, it would make the marriage impossible!

विक्रीतगवीरक्षणम् ॥

Retaining possession of a cow after it has been sold to some one else. This illegality is dealt with by Nārada and Yājnavalkya in the "विक्रीयासम्प्रदानप्रकरणम्", "The non-delivery of a sold chattel." In chapter viii. 1, the former defines it thus:—

" विक्रीय पण्यं मूल्येन क्रेतुर्यन्न प्रदीयते ।
विक्रीयासम्प्रदानं तद्विवादपदमुच्यते " ॥

The latter lays down the law on the subject in chapter ii. 254-8. Udayana's application of the above in *Ātmatattvaviveka,* page 58, is as follows:—

" यदनात्मान एवैताश्चतस्रः कोटयो भासन्ते न वा प्रतिभान्तीति । तत्राप्रतिभानमनुत्तरम् । प्रतिभाने तु ग्राह्यलक्षणायोगेऽपि ग्राह्यभाव इति चेदेवमेतत् ।...प्रकाशमानत्वं तु नीलादीनामशक्यापह्नवम् । तावन्मात्रं चास्माकमभिमतमिति चेत्तदेतद्विक्रीतगवीरक्षणम् " ॥

The drift of this is not very clear.

वृक्षप्रकंपनन्यायः ॥

The illustration of *the shaking of a tree.* A man is supposed to be up a tree whilst others are standing below it. One of the latter points to a particular branch which he wishes to be shaken, and the others point out other branches for the same purpose; so the man shakes the whole tree at once and thus satisfies every body by the one effort! Raghunātha applies this in the following way:—"यत्रैकस्य वस्तुनो मतभेदेन बहूनि रूपाणि तत्तच्छास्त्रेषु प्रतिपाद्यमानान्युपलभ्य क्रिया हि विकल्प्यते न वस्त्विति न्याया-द्वस्तुनि विकल्पासंभवं मत्वा विरुद्धानां समुच्चयस्याप्यसंभवेन तेष्वेकमतप्रति-पादितं सर्वाविरुद्धं वस्तु स्वीक्रियते तत्र वृक्षप्रकंपनन्यायः प्रवर्तते" ॥ In his larger work, Raghunātha says that the simile is also found as वृक्षप्रचलनन्याय, and in this form I have met with it in *Mahābhāṣya,* vol. i. page 23 (bottom), "वृक्षः प्रचलन्सहावयवैः प्रचलति." Also in 6. 1. 1 (vārt. 13).

वृश्चिकभिया पलायमान आशीविषमुखे निपतितः ॥

Running away through fear of a scorpion, he falls into the jaws of a poisonous snake! Avoiding Scylla, he falls into Charybdis! The nyāya occurs in the following passage of the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā,* page 53:—"यद्यपि रागादिनिवृत्तिहेतु-नैरात्म्यदर्शनं तथापि नास्ति कर्म नास्ति कर्मफलमिति इष्टेः परमं निदानम्। एवं प्रेत्यभावाभावज्ञानस्य च। तथा च दुःखहेतोर्हेयवर्गस्याभावान्न तद्धानाया-नेन घटितव्यम्। न चाघटमानो ह्ययं हातुमर्हति सोऽयं वृश्चिकभिया पलाय-मान आशीविषमुखे निपतितः" ॥ It is found also in *Kusumānjali* ii. 3 (page 328), in *Vidvanmaṇḍana,* page 4, and in *Nyāya-makaranda,* page 223. Of somewhat similar import is the nyāya "एकामसिद्धिं परिहरतो द्वितीयापद्यते", which see.

वृश्चिकीगर्भन्यायः ॥

For this see the अश्वतरीगर्भन्याय.

व्यालनकुलन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the snake and the mungoose.* The well-known innate antipathy of these two for one another (*Pāṇini* 2. 4. 9.) is a commonly-used illustration of inherent opposition between two things. Mr. Tawney has reminded me of the story in *Panchatantra* V. 2. which speaks of the enmity between them in the following words:—"अत्रान्तरे दैववशात्कृष्णसर्पो बिलान्निष्क्रान्तः । नकुलोऽपि तं स्वभाववैरिणं मत्वा भ्रातू रक्षणार्थं सर्पेण सह युद्ध्वा सर्पं खण्डशः कृतवान्" ॥ The nyāya is employed by Udayana in *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 53, as follows:—"स्वसंविदि तद्रूपत्वादिति चेत्तत्किमङ्गपरिणतशान्तेराश्रमपदमिव विज्ञानमासाद्य व्यालनकुलादेरिव नीलधवलादेः शाश्वतिकविरोधत्यागो निभृतवैराणां तत्फलत्यागो वा । न तावत्प्रथमः परस्परनिषेधविधिनान्तरीयकविधिनिषेधयोरविरोधे जगति विरोधोच्छेदप्रसङ्गात्" ॥ It is more commonly known as अहिनकुलन्याय.

शतपत्रपत्रशतभेदन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the* [apparently simultaneous] *piercing* [with a needle] *of one hundred lotus leaves.* It is found under the figure समुच्चय in *Kuvalayānanda*, in connection with the following example:—

" बिभ्राणा हृदये त्वया विनिहितं प्रेमाभिधानं नवं
शल्यं यद्विदधाति सा विधुरिता साधो तदाकर्ण्यताम् ।
शेते शुष्यति ताम्यति प्रलपति प्रम्लायति प्रेंखति
भ्राम्यत्युल्लुठति प्रणश्यति गलत्युन्मूर्च्छति त्रुट्यति ॥

अत्र कासांचित्क्रियाणां किञ्चित्कालभेदसंभवेऽपि शतपत्रपत्रशतभेदन्यायेन यौगपद्यं विरहातिशयद्योतनाय विवक्षितमिति लक्षणानुगतिः" ॥

In the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, also, we have the same idea somewhat differently expressed in the description of असंलक्ष्यक्रमव्यंग्य. The following is the passage (on page 102) with Mr. Pramadādāsa Mitra's translation:—

" अत्र व्यंग्यप्रतीतेर्विभावादिप्रतीतिकारणकत्वात्क्रमोऽवश्यमस्ति किन्तूत्पलपत्रशतव्यतिभेदवल्लाघवान्न संलक्ष्यते " ॥ " Now, the perception of the suggested, caused as it is by, and hence succeeding, the perception of the Accessories &c., has necessarily a process, but from its quickness it is not perceived, like the *process of the apparently simultaneous* piercing through of a hundred lotus leaves *placed one upon another.*" The expression "उत्पलशतपत्रव्यतिभेदवत्" is used by Aniruddha in his comment on *Sānkhyasūtra* ii. 32; and Dr. Garbe thinks that he took it from the *Sāhityadarpaṇa.* See his Preface to the *Sānkhyasūtravṛitti.* There are two examples of this nyāya in S'rīdhara's *Nyāyakandali.* On page 23:—"यद्गच्छति तत्सन्निहितव्यवहितार्थौ क्रमेण प्राप्नोति तत्कथं शाखाचन्द्रमसोस्तुल्यकालोपलब्धिरिति चेदिन्द्रियवृत्तेराशुसञ्चारित्वात्पलाशशतव्यतिभेदवत्क्रमाग्रहणनिमित्तोऽयं भ्रमो न तु वास्तवं यौगपद्यम्." The other is on page 158.

A much older example is found in *S'lokavārtika*, page 311 (verse 157), to which I append Mr. Gangānātha Jhā's translation:—"यत्प्रदीपप्रभाद्युक्तं सूक्ष्मकालोऽस्ति तत्र नः । दुर्लक्षस्तु यथा वेधः पद्मपत्रशते तथा." "You have brought forward the case of the lamp and the light emitted by it, as an instance of the simultaneity of the cause and the effect. But in this case also, there is a minute point of time (intervening between the appearance of the lamp and that of the light), though this is imperceptible; just as is the case with the piercing (with a needle) of the hundred petals of the lotus." Professor Jacobi has kindly pointed out an instance of it in *Nyāyavārtika*, page 37, in the form उत्पलदलशतव्यतिभेदवत्, from which, perhaps, Aniruddha took the nyāya rather than from the very modern *Sāhityadarpaṇa.* The same expression उत्पलपत्रशतव्यतिभेदवत् is found in the Jaina work *Syādvādamanjarī* (page 92). Besides these, I have met with the nyāya in *Tātparyaṭīkā*, page 334, line 2 (in the form शीघ्रतरबाणहेतुकशतपत्रशतव्यतिभेदवत्); in *Nyāyamanjarī*, page 498 (as सूच्यग्राभिद्यमानकोकनददलकदम्बकवत्); in *Tarkabhāṣāṭīkā*, page 24; in *Tārkikarakṣāṭīkā*, page 126 (as शतपत्रशातनवत्); and in *Citsukhī* ii. 9 (शतपत्रपत्रशतव्यतिभेदानुभववत्).

शते पञ्चाशत् ॥

Fifty [is contained] *in a hundred.* The greater includes the less. In the *Vācaspatyam* the nyāya is thus defined:— "व्यापकशतसंख्यायां यथा व्याप्यपञ्चाशत्संख्या निविष्टा एवं यत्र व्यापके व्याप्यस्य निवेशस्तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ I have met with it only in the *Vedāntakalpataru*, page 121, line 12, where a highly technical passage from S'abara 6. 1. 43 is discussed, regarding the pronouncement of the names of Pravaras at new and full moon sacrifices. A reference to Kunte's षड्दर्शनचिन्तनिका, page 1776, would throw light on this dark passage.

शवोद्वर्तनन्यायः ॥

The simile of *perfuming a dead body.* For the application and illustration see अरण्यरोदनन्याय.

शाखाचन्द्रन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the moon upon a bough.* Molesworth defines it thus:—"A Sanskrit phrase adduced as a simile or an illustration when an object seen or a matter debated has its position or relation assigned to it as at, on, in consistency with &c. a particular object or matter, simply from the appearance of contiguity or connection which, under one line of view or one train of reasoning, it ordinarily presents; whilst actually and truly it is remote from it so widely as to preclude altogether affirmation of connection. We say the sun sinks in the ocean by the same law as we say the moon is upon a bough of a tree, speaking in both cases from the appearance presented." It is thus akin to the अरुन्धतीप्रदर्शनन्याय. The following example is found in *Taitirīyabhāshyavārtika* 2. 1. 232 (page 88):— तरुशाखाग्रदृष्ट्यैव सोमं यद्वत्प्रदर्शयेत् । निष्कोशं कोशदृष्ट्यैव प्रतीचि ब्रह्म दर्श्यते" ॥ And in *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, page 202, we

read:—"नन्वत्र सूत्रे ब्रह्मस्वरूपलक्षणं नोक्तं न च तदन्तरेण स्वरूपमवगम्यते प्रकृष्टप्रकाशात्मत्वमनुक्त्वा शाखाग्रे चन्द्र इत्येवोक्ते चन्द्रस्वरूपानवगमात्" ॥

सकृत्कृते कृतः शास्त्रार्थः ॥

To do a thing once is sufficient to satisfy the demands of the S'āstra. The nyāya is found in *Mahābhāṣya* 6. 1. 84 (vārt. 4), 108 (vārt. 3), and in 6. 4. 104 (vārt. 3). Also in S'abara 11. 1. 28, 35; and 12. 3, 10. It seems to resemble the Marāṭhī phrase शास्त्रापुरता, which Molesworth thus defines:—"To be enough indeed for the supplying, serving, or fulfilling of any matter or point required by the S'āstra, but without excess beyond; to exist in just sufficient quantity, or to be performed with just sufficient definiteness of action, as to warrant the name or designation borne, and to preclude disallowal of its existence or its performance; *to be enough to swear by."* The Sanskrit phrase occurs also in *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, page 154 (line 2 from bottom):—"ननु सकृत्कृते कृतः शास्त्रार्थ इति न्यायेन सकृदध्ययनादेव नित्याध्ययनविधिसिद्धेरावृत्तिर्न लभ्येतेति चेन्न" ॥ See too *Bhāmatī* 4. 1. 12, and compare कपिञ्जलन्याय.

सकृत्प्रवृत्तायाः किमवगुण्ठनेन ॥

A woman who has fallen once need veil her face no more. This occurs in *Tantravārtika*, pages 703, 704, in the course of the discussion (under 3. 1. 12) of the meaning of the expression "अरुणया पिङ्गाक्ष्यैकहायन्या सोमं क्रीणाति". On page 703 we read:— "अरुणाशब्दस्तावदवश्यमेव केनचिद्गुणिना सम्बन्धनीयः । एकहायनीशब्दस्यापि क्रियासम्बन्धात्स्वातन्त्र्यमपनीतम् । तत्र पदान्तरसम्बन्धेऽपि सकृत्प्रवृत्तायाः किमवगुण्ठनेनेतिवत्तस्य तावत्येव श्रुतिपीडेति." The nyāya is quoted by Pārthasārathi in *S'āstradīpikā* 1. 4. 4 (page 177, line 6 from bottom), while discussing the subject of words like Agnihotra &c., as the names of sacrifices.

सदृशात्सदृशोद्भवः ॥

Like produces like. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa denies that this is a fixed principle, on the ground that scorpions are produced from cowdung. He puts it thus (page 466):—

"न चैष नियमो लोके सदृशात्सदृशोद्भवः ।
वृश्चिकादेः समुत्पादो गोमयादपि दृश्यते" ॥

This "old wives' fable" regarding the scorpion was deeply rooted in the Indian mind! It is found in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 4. 30, and is used as an illustration by S'ankarācārya in his bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra* 2. 1. 6. Rāmānuja followed suit. Udayana, too, has it in his vṛitti on *Kusumānjali* ii. 2, and the commentator Haridāsa remarks that a scorpion can be produced from cowdung as well as from a scorpion.

Thanks, however, to the now well-established Law of Biogenesis, we are better informed at the present time. To quote Henry Drummond:—"It is now recognized on every hand that Life can only come from the touch of Life. Huxley categorically announces that the doctrine of Biogenesis, or life only from life, is 'victorious along the whole line at the present day.' And even whilst confessing that he wishes the evidence were the other way, Tyndall is compelled to say, 'I affirm that no shred of trustworthy experimental testimony exists to prove that life in our day has ever appeared independently of antecedent life'."

सन्दिग्धे न्यायः प्रवर्त्तत इति न्यायः ॥

When there is doubt reason comes into play. This is found in Jnānottama's comment on *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* iv. 3. He says:—
"सन्दिग्धे न्यायः प्रवर्त्तत इति न्यायात्सन्दिग्धस्यैव विचार्यत्वात्तत्परिशोधयितुम-

विप्रतिपन्नमर्थं तावद्दर्शयति." Akin to this is the nyāya "सन्दिग्धं सप्रयोजनं च विचारमर्हति, " which is found in the earlier part of the same work (namely in the comment on i. 29), and which Raghunātha expounds thus in his smaller work :—"विचारपाटवेन यावद्यावद्विवेकदार्ढ्यं भवति तावत्तावद्भ्रमशैथिल्यं जायते तरतमभावापन्नसाधनायत्तं फलं तरतमभावापन्नमिति न्यायात् । विचारविषयत्वं च नाज्ञातस्य नापि निश्चितस्य किंतु सन्दिग्धस्य सन्दिग्धं सप्रयोजनं च विचारमर्हतीति न्यायात्."

सर्वनाशे समुत्पन्ने अर्धं त्यजति पण्डितः ॥

When the loss of all is impending, a wise man will give up half [if by so doing he can save the other half]. It occurs twice in the *Pancatantra*, namely in iv. 27, and v. 42, as follows :—

"सर्वनाशे समुत्पन्ने अर्धं त्यजति पण्डितः ।
अर्धेन कुरुते कार्यं सर्वनाशो हि दुस्तरः ॥"

In the second passage, the final word is दुःसहः. See Dr. Bühler's note on समुत्पन्ने अर्धं. The first half of this couplet is quoted in Kumārila's *Tantravārtika*, page 91, but there the reading is ह्यर्धं.

सर्वं ज्ञानं धर्मिण्यभ्रान्तं प्रकारे तु व्यत्ययः ॥

No cognition is erroneous in respect of a thing as possessed of certain properties; but there may be error in regard to the exact form of the thing. For example, a man sees a glittering object on the ground, and supposes it to be silver; but it turns out to be nacre and not silver. There is no mistake in his cognition of the shining object, but his conception of the *nature* of the object is erroneous. The nyāya is found in *Citsukhī*

ii. 18 (The Paṇḍit, vol. v. page 496):—"सर्वं ज्ञानं धर्मिण्यभ्रान्तं प्रकारे तु व्यत्यय इति वदद्भिरिदं रजतमिति विभ्रमज्ञानमिदमंशे प्रमाणमप्रमाणं रजतांशेऽभ्युपगम्यते परीक्षकैः" ॥

Underlying the words "सविकल्पकनिर्विकल्पकयोस्तु प्रमायामप्रमायां चान्तर्भावः" ॥ on page 25 of the *Saptapadārthī*, we find the following comment :—"रजते एवेदं रजतमिति सविकल्पकं प्रमा । अरजते रजतज्ञानं भ्रम इत्यर्थः । निर्विकल्पकं तु प्रमायामेवान्तर्भवति । तस्य प्रथमाक्ष-सन्निपातजस्य वस्तुस्वरूपमात्रविषयस्य क्वाप्यबाधात् । सर्वं ज्ञानं धर्मिण्यभ्रान्तं प्रकारे तु व्यत्यय इति न्यायात् । निर्विकल्पकस्य च प्रकाराभावात्" ॥

Another interesting example is to be found in *Tattvamuktākalāpa* iv. 104. I subjoin the second half of the verse and a portion of the author's own vṛitti on it :—

"आत्मस्वात्मांशयोश्च क्वचिदपि न भवेद्भ्रान्तिरंशान्तरेऽपि स्यादेषा न स्वरूपे क्वचन परमसौ द्विप्रकारे प्रकारे" ॥ "अंशान्तरेऽपि विषयांशेऽप्येषा भ्रान्तिः । स्वरूपे क्वचन न स्यात्सर्वं ज्ञानं धर्मिण्यभ्रान्तमिति वचनात् । तथा च विषयेऽपि स्वरूपांशे सर्वज्ञानसाधारण्यात्प्रामाण्यस्य स्वाभाविकत्वमेव युक्तमित्यर्थः । तर्हि कुत्र भ्रान्तिरित्यत आह परमिति । असौ भ्रान्तिर्द्विप्रकारे प्रकारे । द्विप्रकारे स्वरूपनिरूपकधर्मे निरूपितस्वरूपविशेषकधर्मे चेत्यर्थः । इदं रजतमित्यत्र स्वरूपनिरूपकधर्मिवैपरीत्यम् । पीतः शंख इत्यत्र निरूपितस्वरूपविशेषकधर्मवैपरीत्यमिति विभागः" ॥

On page 403 of Vidyāsāgara's ṭikā on *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya* the nyāya is ascribed to लीलावतीकार. I would commend to students a helpful note (No 34) at the end of Professor M. N. Dvivedi's edition of the *Tarkakaumudī*, as bearing on the principle enunciated in this nyāya.

सविशेषणे हीति न्यायः ॥

In this contracted form the nyāya is quoted by the author of the *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* (chapter vii, page 411); in its entirety

it reads thus:—"सविशेषणे हि विधिनिषेधौ विशेष्ये बाधे सति विशेषणमुपसंक्रामतः" ॥ The following is Mr. Arthur Venis' rendering of it (in The Paṇḍit, vol. vii. page 460):—"An affirmation or a negation, when made of a subject together with its predicate, applies to the predicate if a bar exists to the affirmation or negation being attached to the subject". An extract from *Rational Refutation of Hindu philosophical Systems* (page 232) may tend to elucidate the above. "When the Vedāntins give to intelligence appropriated to the internal organ the name of subject of right notion, we are to understand, that the character which they ascribe to intelligence associated with the internal organ, really belongs to that organ. They have a maxim,–which all the other Systems subscribe to,–that 'An affirmation, or a negation, when predicated of anything together with its associate, if debarred from the object substantive, is to be referred to the object adjective'. In their opinion, the quality of being a cognizer cannot be assigned to the soul, and, consequently, is debarred from it."

The nyāya is found in *Tātparyaṭīkā*, page 31, line 5, and in *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 72, line 3 from bottom; but, in both cases, without the words "विशेष्ये बाधे सति." It is quoted, too, in *Laukikanyāyasangraha*, page 69, line 15.

सहैव दशभिः पुत्रैर्भारं वहति गर्दभी ॥

Though possessing ten sons the mother-donkey carries the load! This evidently well-known saying, taken from *Tantravārtika*, page 807, is found in *Bhāmatī* 3. 4. 33 (page 691) in the following connection:—"सहकारित्वं च कर्मणां न कार्ये विद्यायाः किं तूत्पत्तौ कोऽर्थो विद्यासहकारीणि कर्माणीत्ययमर्थः । सत्सु कर्मसु विद्यैव स्वकार्ये व्याप्रियते । यथा सहैव दशभिः पुत्रैर्भारं वहति गर्दभीति सत्स्वेव

दशपुत्रेषु सैव भारस्य वाहिकेति" ॥ The saying is quoted by Ānandagiri also, in his comment on the same portion of the bhāshya. See, too, *Vedāntas'ikhāmaṇi*, p. 168.

सुन्दोपसुन्दन्यायः ॥

The simile of *Sunda and Upasunda.* Used of conflicting and mutually destructive things. It is thus explained by Raghunāthavarmā in his *Laukikanyāyasangraha*:-"अन्योन्यनाश्यनाशकभावविवक्षायां सुन्दोपसुन्दन्यायः । यथा हि सुन्दोपसुन्दसञ्ज्ञौ सहोदरावसुरौ तिलोत्तमार्थं वध्यघातकभावेनोभावपि नष्टाविति भारते प्रसिद्धम् । तथा वीचीतरङ्गन्यायेनोत्पन्नानां कार्यशब्दनाश्यानामन्त्योपान्त्यशब्दौ परस्परेण नाश्यावन्त्य उपान्त्येनोपान्त्यश्चान्त्येनेति केचित्तार्किकाः" ॥

The story of Sunda and Upasunda is told at great length in *Ādiparva* ccix–ccxii, but is condensed into six verses in *Kathāsaritsāgara* xv., of which the following is Mr. Tawney's translation:—"There were two brothers, Asuras by race, Sunda and Upasunda, hard to overcome, in as much as they surpassed the three worlds in valour. And Brahmā, wishing to destroy them, gave an order to Vis'vakarman, and had constructed a heavenly woman named Tilottamā, in order to behold whose beauty even S'iva truly became four-faced, so as to look four ways at once, while she was devoutly circumambulating him. She, by the order of Brahmā, went to Sunda and Upasunda, while they were in the garden of Kailāsa, in order to seduce them. And both those two Asuras distracted with love, seized the fair one at the same time by both her arms, the moment they saw her near them. And as they were dragging her off in mutual opposition, they soon came to blows, and both of them were destroyed." The simile is met with in *Sānkhyatattvakaumudī* 13, as follows:—"ननु परस्परविरोधशीला गुणाः सुन्दोपसुन्दवत्परस्परं ध्वंसन्त इत्येव युक्तं प्रागेव तेषामेकक्रियाकर्तृतायाः" ॥ See also Kāmanda-

kīya *Nītisāra*, ix. 61. In *Sarvārthasiddhi* (on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii. 53) we have the expression "सुन्दोपसुन्दविषनाशकविषन्यायेन." This nyāya is used, says Raghunātha, when the things in opposition are of equal strength; but when they are of unequal strength, and the weaker go to the wall, the *Mātsyanyāya* is employed.

सुभगाभिक्षुकन्यायः ॥

Sankalpasuryodaya 2, 92, 1 with explanation

The simile of *Subhagā and the mendicant.* The following is Raghunātha's explanation of it:—"एकत्र विरुद्धानेकधर्मसमावेशासंभवविवक्षायां तु सुभगाभिक्षुकन्यायः प्रवर्तते। यथा सुभगत्वं भिक्षुकत्वं स्त्रीत्वं पुंस्त्वं च तथाविधपदद्वयसामानाधिकरण्यात्प्रतीयमानमपि विरुद्धत्वादेकस्मिन्युगपन्न संभवति तथैकस्मिन्नीशरूपाप्तवचने प्रामाण्याप्रामाण्यलक्षणविरुद्धं धर्मद्वयं न संभवतीति केचित् । अन्ये तु यथा सुभगाभिक्षुकौ प्रबलघातकभयात्कंचिच्छरणं प्रपन्नौ स च शरणागतत्यागदोषश्रवणात्सर्वप्रयत्नेनोभयो रक्षणे प्रबलारिकृतस्वघातभयेन त्यागे वा प्राप्तेऽपि सुभगां रक्षति भिक्षुकं त्यजतीति यत्तत्र तस्येच्छैव नियामिका न तु किंचिद्विनिगमकमस्ति तथा प्रकृतेऽपीशवचनत्वादुभयोः प्रामाण्ये पौरुषेयत्वान्मूलप्रमाणसापेक्षतया धर्मादौ तदभावादप्रामाण्ये वा प्राप्तेऽप्युक्तविभागे तार्किकेच्छैव नियामिकेत्यर्थमाहुः" ॥ This seems to me very unsatisfactory, but I can suggest nothing better. The only work in which I have met with the nyāya is the *Ātmatattvaviveka* (page 54), where it is wrongly printed as सुभगाभिकन्याय. It would need a long extract to make it intelligible, so I must refer the reader to the work itself.

सोपानारोहणन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the ascent of a staircase.* Used of knowledge arrived at gradually, by easy steps. "Line upon line, precept

upon precept, here a little and there a little." There is an instance of its use in *Bhāmatī* 1. 3. 8 (page 201):—"एवं चानात्मविद् आत्मानं विविदिषोर्नारदस्य प्रश्ने परमात्मानमेवास्मै व्याख्यास्यामीत्यभिसन्धिमान्सनत्कुमारः सोपानारोहणन्यायेन स्थूलादारभ्य तत्तद्भूमव्युत्पादनक्रमेण भूमानमतिदुर्ज्ञानतया परमसूक्ष्मं व्युत्पादयामास" ॥

सौभरिन्यायः ॥

The illustration afforded by *Saubhari*. The story of this sage is told in Book 4, chapter 2, of the *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, and, with less detail, in Book 9, chapter 6, of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. We there learn that, after remaining immersed in a piece of water for twelve years, the Muni was so much impressed by the happiness of the little fish which disported themselves around their great progenitor named Sammada, that he determined to marry and raise up progeny himself! He accordingly went to king Māndhātā, the father of fifty charming daughters, and asked for one of them in marriage. Taken somewhat aback by the appearance of this old and emaciated suitor, but fearing to displease him, the king replied that it was the custom for princesses to select their own husband, but that if any one of them chose him as such, he could take her to wife. He was accordingly conducted to the ladies' apartments; but, on the way there, he transformed his repelling person into one of handsome and youthful appearance, and the consequence was that each of the fifty maidens fell violently in love with him and demanded him as a husband, and so he married them all! Each of them lived in a beautiful mansion by herself, surrounded by every luxury. After a time, the king went on a visit to them to see how they fared. The first one pointed to her lovely surroundings and told of her husband's goodness to her, but added that there was one thing

which troubled her very much, namely, that her husband was *always* with her, and therefore her sisters could never enjoy his society at all. The king then visited each of the others in turn, and heard exactly the same thing from each; and so the necessary inference is that the sage *entered into fifty bodies* at one and the same time, and this is the sole point of the nyāya! It occurs in *Bhāmatī* 4. 4. 11 as follows:—"सौभरेरभिविनिर्मितविविधदेहस्यापर्यायेण मान्धातृकन्याभिः पञ्चाशता विहारः पौराणिकैः स्मर्यते." Venkaṭanātha is the only other writer in whose works I have met with it. On page 65 of the *Nyāyasiddhānjana* we read:—"भास्करमते तु नित्यसर्वज्ञस्योपाधियोग एव परिहास्यः। उपाधिभिश्छेदनाद्ययोगेन ब्रह्मण एव संसारित्वानपायः। उपाधिसञ्चारे प्रतिक्षणं बन्धमोक्षप्रसङ्गः सौभर्यादिवदुपाधिभेदेऽपि प्रतिसन्धानस्य दुस्त्यजत्वात्। छेदाभ्युपगमे चाच्छेद्यत्ववादविरोधः" ॥ In his vritti on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* iii. 22, where the same subject is discussed, we find the following:—

"न च स्वेनान्यदेहादेरधिष्ठानादिसम्भवः।
सौभरिन्यायतस्तत्तत्प्रतिवन्दिप्रसङ्गतः" ॥

It occurs again in the text and comment of verse 31.

स्फटिकलौहित्यन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the redness of the crystal.* Such redness is owing to the proximity of a red object, such as a rose &c. The illustration is much used by writers on Vedānta &c. For example, we read in *Paramārthasāra,* verses 16 and 61:—

" नानाविधवस्तूनां वर्णान्धत्ते यथामलः स्फटिकः।
तद्वदुपाधेर्गुणभावितस्य भावं विभुर्धत्ते ॥ १६ ॥
विगतोपाधिः स्फटिकः स्वप्रभया भाति निर्मलो यद्वत्।
चिद्दीपः स्वप्रभया तथा विभातीह निरुपाधिः ॥ ६१ ॥"

So, too, Aniruddha on *Sānkhyasūtra* ii. 35:—"यथा जपाकुसुमसंसर्गात्स्फटिके लौहित्यं तदपगमात्स्फटिकः स्वरूपेणावतिष्ठते"॥ See also *Atmabodha,* 14; and a verse, by some unknown author, quoted in

the Panini section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 144 Bib. Ind., and 163 in Jīvānanda's edn.). In the *Kuvalayānanda* (page 289) under the figure अतद्गुण, we read:—"अन्यदीयगुणग्रहणाग्रहणे च रक्तस्फटिकवस्त्रमालिन्यादिन्यायेनान्यदीयगुणेनैवानुरञ्जनाननुरञ्जने विवक्षिते" ॥ See also *Vivaraṇaprameya*, page 214.

स्वभावो दुरतिक्रमः ॥

Nature is hard to overcome. This is no doubt based on *Hitopades'a* iii. 56:—

"यः स्वभावो हि यस्य स्यात्तस्यासौ दुरतिक्रमः ।
श्वा यदि क्रियते राजा तत्किं नाश्नात्युपानहम् ॥"

Raghunātha applies it in the following manner:—"ननु सविलासाज्ञानबाधकस्वभावत्वं चेद्बोधस्य तदा स्वभावो दुरतिक्रम इति न्यायात्तत्त्वज्ञस्य ज्ञानोदयानन्तरं सविलासाज्ञानबाधनाद्देहपातस्तात्कालिकः स्यात्तथा चोच्छिन्नसंप्रदायकत्वादुपनिषदामबोधत्वलक्षणाप्रामाण्यप्रसङ्ग इति शंकानिरासाय यदाज्ञानस्य नाशोऽप्यारब्धकर्मणा प्रतिबन्धान्न देहादिक्षय आरब्धकर्मणश्च भोगलक्षणकार्यक्षयादेव क्षय इति समाधीयते तदेषुवेगक्षयन्यायप्रवृत्तिः । धनुषः सकाशान्मुक्तस्येषोर्बाणस्य कर्मणः प्रारब्धवेगक्षयादेव क्षय इति प्रसिद्धम्" ॥

The expression occurs also in the following verse of the *Kusumānjali* (i. 7):—

"एकस्य न क्रमः क्वापि वैचित्र्यं च समस्य न ।
शक्तिभेदो न चाभिन्नः स्वभावो दुरतिक्रमः" ॥

स्वविषमूर्च्छितो भुजङ्ग आत्मानमेव दशति ॥

The snake stupified by its own poison bites its own body! This saying is found in Udayana's *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 67, line 6:—"यदि हि न ज्ञातं किञ्चिदस्तीत्यादिप्रतिज्ञार्थः प्रतिज्ञां स्पृशेत्कथमयमर्थः प्रत्येतव्यः । नचेत्कथं सानुपपन्ना । तदुपपन्नत्वे च कथं पुनः प्रतिज्ञार्थ उपपद्यते । तदिदमायातं स्वविषमूर्च्छितो भुजङ्ग आत्मानमेव दशतीति" ॥

स्वामिभृत्यन्यायः ॥

The simile of *the relation as master and servant.* "It is used to mark the relation of the feeder and the fed, or the supporter and the supported, subsisting between any two objects." Āpṭe's *Sanskrit Dictionary*. It is of very common occurrence. For instance, in S'ankara's bhāshya on *Brahmasūtra* 2. 1. 4 in a discussion as to the relation between Brahma and the world, he says:—"नहि साम्ये सत्युपकार्योपकारकभावो भवति। नहि प्रतीपौ परस्परस्योपकुरुतः । ननु चेतनमपि कार्यकारणं स्वामिभृत्यन्यायेन भोक्तुरुपकरिष्यति । न । स्वामिभृत्ययोरप्यचेतनांशस्यैव चेतनं प्रत्युपकारकत्वात्" ॥ Also in 2. 3. 43, we read:—"ततश्च जीवेश्वरयोरप्युपकार्योपकारकभावाभ्युपगमात्किं स्वामिभृत्यवत्संबन्ध आहोस्विदग्निविस्फुलिङ्गवदित्यस्यां विचिकित्सायामनियमो वा प्राप्नोति" ॥ See, too, Rāmatīrtha on *Vedāntasāra* 19 (page 141, last line).

ह्रदनक्रन्यायः ॥

The simile of *an alligator in a lake.* Used of things which mutually aid or protect each other. See वनसिंहन्याय.

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS ON THE FIRST HANDFUL.

"There are few books which give the results of so much reading in so small a compass as this little pamphlet of some fifty pages. As its name indicates, it is a collection of those popular maxims, or, as Dr. Bühler calls them, "inferences from familiar instances," which one hears so frequently in conversation with Pandits.........Similiar collections have been frequently put together...but we very rarely find in these any reference to the use of nyāyas in actual literature. The great value of Colonel Jacob's work is that at least one such reference is given for every maxim quoted. He has drawn principally from works on philosophy and on rhetoric, branches of Sanskrit literature which he has made peculiarly his own, and the modestly styled 'Handful' is only one more example of the labourious care and love of accuracy for which its author is distinguished.

The book is useful to other than Sanskrit scholars.............The student of Tulasī Dāsa, or of Malik Muhmmad, will find many an obscure passage illumined by this true *dehalī-dīpaka*, throwing light, as it does, both upon the past and on the present."

Journal of Royal Asiatic Society (July 1901).

"Under the title 'Laukikanyāyāñjali,' or 'A handful of Popular Maxims', Colonel G. A. Jacob has published and explained a number of those allusions to popular and, at the time, no doubt, well-known proverbs or stories which abound in Sanskrit literature. These nyāyas find their parallels from our own language in such common sayings as 'like the pot and the kettle', 'like the hare and the tortoise' etc. The proverbs or stories to which they allude are perfectly well-known and need no explanation. In the case of their Sanskrit

counterparts, the memory of their origin has not always been preserved or has become obscured. The list now published consists of those examples which Colonel Jacob has been able either to trace to their source or to partly explain. Let us hope that this useful little work, the result of many years of reading may, in his own words, 'become the nucleus of a very much larger collection'."

Luzac's *Oriental List* (March-April 1901).

"From what we have written above, we think our readers will see what a useful little book Colonel Jacob's is, especially for those who wish to address the people of this land in forms of speech and with thoughts that are familiar to them.

Prakās'ak (Kolhapur, March 1900).

Printed by B. R. Ghanekar at "Nirnaya-sagar" Press, by the publisher.